By William Jewett Tucker, D. D.

PERSONAL POWER. Counsels to College Men. Crown 8vo, $1.50 *net*. Postage extra.

THE MAKING AND UNMAKING OF THE PREACHER. Lectures on the Lyman Beecher Foundation, Yale University, 1898. 12mo, gilt top, $1.50.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
BOSTON AND NEW YORK

# PERSONAL POWER

# PERSONAL POWER

## Counsels to College Men

BY

WILLIAM JEWETT TUCKER

MORRIS-HARVEY COLLEGE LIBRARY
BARBOURSVILLE, W. VA.

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
The Riverside Press Cambridge

Do not return to library.

COPYRIGHT, 1910, BY WILLIAM JEWETT TUCKER

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

*Published March 1910*

FOURTH IMPRESSION

233.6
T19p
494

# PREFACE

Among our social institutions the college stands by common consent for the quickening of personal power. Incidentally the same end is reached through various agencies, as notably through the competition of business, but no business exists for this purpose. Every college does exist chiefly for this purpose. The burden which society thus lays upon the college is not only greater than appears, it is also an increasing burden. It is becoming more and more a necessity to awaken the consciousness of power, as well as to utilize and direct it. The inference can no longer be drawn that the college is the first goal of the ambitious youth. Owing to the more relaxed and less stimulating life in many homes, not a few of those who are sent to college find there the first chance for mental or moral quickening which they have known. Many others need to have their sense of power deepened and steadied; while others still are ready for the wise but urgent incentive to the right use of personal power. Doubtless it is necessary, and perhaps it is fair, that this increasing burden should fall

494

upon the college, for if not upon the college, upon what? Who or what shall assume the responsibility for the very considerable amount of intelligent but unquickened life in a prosperous democracy? If the colleges were to consider only their scholastic interests they would ignore altogether this phase of modern social life. The college would be the home for the time being of the scholar pure and simple. But within those limits of scholarship which must at all cost be maintained, the college, like the more responsible individual, may be expected to attend to its social duty.

The method of discharging this social obligation, of quickening, that is, the sense of personal power in the average college student, is one of the most perplexing questions of college administration. Difficult as it is to provide the means and facilities for instruction, it is still more difficult to insure the moral supports of instruction. The intellectual impulse is seldom sufficient for the proper demands of the intellectual life. The rightly adjusted will and the fit motive are essential elements in the intellectual growth of the college man. Furthermore it must be considered that the process of moral education in our colleges is very largely that of the education of the individual through the mass, a slow, hard,

and often unsatisfying process, but one for which there is no equivalent, and for which there can be no substitute. The average student will not be made better except by the use of such motives and influences as are able to lift the whole body of which he is a part. College sentiment is the most potent influence for good or ill to which one is exposed during the period of college residence. College men are very human, more so than other men of their age, because they live in an intensely human environment. It therefore pays morally to work for years, if need be, to eradicate bad traditions or customs, to elevate standards, to create a sentiment which is vital enough to be aggressive. But whether the appeal be made to the individual through the mass, or directly, the ground of the appeal is personal power, implied or in part realized. The awakening or quickening of the sense of personal power is on the whole the greatest safeguard against the risks of college life. The temptations of the flesh and of the mind usually grow less as the sense of power increases, for with the increase of the sense of power there comes the sense of responsibility, and the sense of responsibility often becomes the stepping-stone to some generous consecration. The moral equipment of a college is made up almost necessarily of motives

and incentives addressed to the latent or partially developed consciousness of personal power.

The Sunday vesper service in Rollins Chapel at Dartmouth gave me while president of the college the unusual opportunity of attempting to supply to some degree what I have called the moral supports of instruction. The appeal to the consciousness of personal power was seldom taken directly, but it was always implied. The service allowed a very wide range of subject, and an entirely informal habit of speech. But the principle there made use of so far approved itself to my judgment that I did not hesitate to transfer it to more formal occasional addresses or sermons, some of which have been gathered up into the present volume. The local allusions, which were made chiefly in the addresses, have been allowed to remain, as they were such as to furnish the setting natural to any college. The volume itself may be simply an afterword to graduates of the last decade here or elsewhere; it may also be a new word to some among the undergraduates of to-day.

William Jewett Tucker.

Hanover, N. H. February, 1910.

# CONTENTS


I

PROVISIONAL SELF-GOVERNMENT . . . . . 3

Ephesians iv, 13

"Until we come . . . unto a perfect man."

II

THE ESTIMATION OF POWER . . . . . 15

2 Samuel xxiii, 16

"And the three mighty men brake through the host of the Philistines, and drew water out of the well of Beth-lehem, that was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David: nevertheless he would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto the Lord."

III

WISDOM THE PRINCIPAL THING . . . . . 31

Proverbs iv, 7

"Wisdom is the principal thing: therefore get wisdom: yea with all thy getting get understanding."

IV

THE UNEARNED INCREMENT IN MODERN LIFE . . 45

Luke xix, 26

"I say unto you, That unto every one which hath shall be given."

## V

PROFESSIONAL VALUES . . . . . 64

Acts x, 15

"And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, call not thou common."

## VI

THE DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONAL POWER . . . . 81

Matthew x, 8

"Freely ye have received, freely give."

## VII

A MAN'S SOUL AND HIS WORLD . . . . . 97

Matthew xvi, 26

"What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

## VIII

THE CAPACITY FOR THE TRUE . . . . . 114

1 John ii, 8

"Which thing is true in him and in you."

## IX

THE MORALLY WELL-BRED MAN . . . . . 129

Micah vi, 8

"He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

## X

MORAL MATURITY . . . . . 144

MATTHEW vii, 12

"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, even so do ye also to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

## XI

THE SATISFACTIONS OF LIFE IN THE MIDST OF ITS CONTRADICTIONS . . . . . 164

ECCLESIASTES iii, 11

"He hath made everything beautiful in its time: also he hath set eternity in their heart, yet so that man cannot find out the work that God hath done from the beginning even to the end."

## XII

SECOND USES OF MEN — THE RECOVERY OF PERSONAL POWER . . . . . 177

JEREMIAH xviii, 4

"He made it again another vessel."

## THE MORAL TRAINING OF THE COLLEGE MAN

*Addresses at the Opening of Successive College Years 1905–1908.*

I. THE TRAINING OF THE GENTLEMAN . 195

II. THE TRAINING OF THE SCHOLAR . . . 212

III. THE TRAINING OF THE CITIZEN . . . 225

IV. THE TRAINING OF THE ALTRUIST . . 240

THE RELIGION OF THE EDUCATOR . . . 263

*Address in a Lenten Series on "Vocation and Religion," at the Old South Church, Boston.*

# PERSONAL POWER

# PERSONAL POWER

## I

### PROVISIONAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

"Until we come . . . unto a perfect man." — EPHESIANS iv, 13.

IN the discourse of Descartes upon "The Method of Using One's Reason Rightly," a considerable part of which is autobiographical, he says that he had always had an intense desire to learn how to distinguish truth from falsehood, in order that he might be clear about his actions, and that he might be able to walk sure footedly in this life. But as he well knew, the quest after truth which would give this result was not a day's work, but rather a continuous and serious business. Therefore he resolved to set up what he termed "a provisional self-government," of which these were to be the rules. I give the rules as somewhat broadly paraphrased by Mr. Huxley: —

First, that he would submit himself to the laws and religion in which he had been brought up;

Second, that he would act, on all occasions which called for action, promptly, and according to the best of his judgment;

Third, that he would seek happiness in limiting his desires rather than in attempting to satisfy them;

Fourth, that he would make the search after truth the business of his life.

Descartes was just coming of age when he laid down for himself these rules of life.

I borrow for present use this most suggestive term, — "Provisional Self-government," — not as the original and full interpretation of the Scripture from which we started, but as holding a part of the same substantial truth, namely, that the end and goal of our lives is not just at hand, but remote enough, according to God's spacing, for intervening search and endeavor and struggle. "Until we come." What shall we do meanwhile? Organize ourselves, not only for the end, but for the means to the end. In this sense every man is to set up his provisional self-government.

If this then be our immediate concern, on what principles shall we organize our lives? What interpretation shall we put upon life, each upon his own life, viewing it as a means to an end? I answer first, keeping still to the suggestion of the rules which I have quoted, that every man's life, viewed as a means to an end, is a faith. That is the chief part of our inheritance in the world. We

are born into a world which has acquired the habit of looking forward. We look forward because of this habit of the world. The most beautiful, as it was the most awe-inspiring, figure of the old paganisms — they all had it — is the Sibyl, the spirit of prophecy. "In the crowded and familiar scene," as one has said, "of a then living and bustling paganism she is the devotee to the world's hereafter: consecrated to that idea and prospect, she gazes upon the last shore of time: and her sacred brow is lifted up above the throng of common objects and concerns, that her eye may rest upon a mysterious distance and an unknown page of the future history of mankind." The spirit of prophecy was too fine a spirit for paganism to hold. It was continually slipping from its grasp, and with every slip there came the lapse of faith, and with the lapse of faith the loss of moral power. But the spirit of prophecy is the spirit of religion, and when once it found a safe and sure home in Christianity the world began to acquire the habit of faith, — faith in God, then faith in man, and then faith in itself as the home of a redeemed humanity. And this world of acquired faith is our world. The generations of men, slow as they sometimes seem to be, do surely feel the pull of the future, as surely as the tides measure the pull from above.

Now in the judgment of Descartes every man who starts to think and reason for himself, even with the freedom of doubt, ought to keep within this order and movement of the world. As for himself, he would submit to the laws and religion in which he had been brought up. There was the place for him to do his thinking and his questioning.

I make this course definite and practical. Some of you have been brought up in a church ancient and venerable, the home of authority, which has witnessed many revolts from its order and faith, but which abides in power. Let no motive short of a perfectly assured religious advance lead you away. It is no advantage to religion, no advantage whatever to any opposing form of religion, that any one of you should cease to be a devout and loyal son of the Catholic Church. If you ever rightfully cease to be such it must be because of some growing demand of your spiritual nature. Many more of you have been brought up under various forms of the Protestant faith. The origins of your faith are not to be ignored. Through them you have been introduced into the common Christianity. Keep the advantage of the possession of things which have become familiar and sacred. Leave them behind you only as you become sure that you are moving toward greater spiritual free-

dom and power. Whatever may be the religious faith or the religious doubt of any one of you, do not break your connection with the habit of the world, that habit which gives it a future. This would be a sad world if, like the world of paganism, it should lose the spirit of prophecy.

I answer again that every man's life, when viewed as a means to an end, is a series of actions. Activity is not action. Activity is not a necessary means to an end. Action is always a means to some end. A clear and well-defined act never leaves a man as it finds him. It urges him on his way to some end. For an act is infinitely more than the thought which dies in the dream, more than the desire which is not able to gratify itself, more than the resolve which falters on the threshold of action. An act is thought, desire, resolve, passing without the man, and beyond recall, into outward shape. An act is the embodiment of personality. When a man has acted we say that he has put himself on record. We can at any time go back to the act and find him.

There are two ways of accustoming ourselves to think of this constant and vast expenditure of personality. We can think of it as building up another self. We can personify our careers. This is the habit of men of a certain type of ambition. They begin by projecting themselves in

imagination into desired places, or by clothing themselves with power, or by enriching themselves with a fortune. Gradually as they act they try to fill in the picture. They live more and more in this other self. The real man is drawn upon to the last resource to furnish material for his career, a career of which he must take the issue. When the career is ended, the method comes out, and also the contrast between the original and the self-made man.

Or we may learn to think of ourselves with an equal ambition, not only as capable of action in distinction from activity, but as bound to act. We may feel with an equal stir the power of the initiative. But in place of the calculating or the reckless ambition there may be a certain reserve of mastery. Even our earlier choices and acts may come under a provisional self-government. In such event the consciousness is never absent that it is we who are acting, and that we must take the return of our actions to enlarge or to deplete our personality. The man who thus acts does not lose himself in his career; and when that comes to an end, he abides in personal power. One may think of the difference between Napoleon at St. Helena and Washington at Mount Vernon, the one living in his reflections upon his career, the other living in the consciousness

of continued influence. We cannot overestimate, I am sure, the variance between the theory of living for our acts which we may bind up in a career, and the theory of regarding our acts as an integral part of ourselves, every act related to and identified with the intellect, the conscience, and the will. Evidently the man who works upon the latter theory is the man of duty in distinction from the man of mere ambition. And in the long run he has the advantage of his theory, for the world of duty is bigger than the world of ambition. The things which are waiting to be done, and which are asking to be done, are more and greater than the things which are likely to hear our call and come forth to serve our ends. So true is this, that we may not hesitate to apply to the world of duty the fine word of the prophet: "Since the beginning of the world men have not heard, nor perceived by the ear, neither hath the eye seen, O God, beside thee, what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for him."

I answer, again, that every man's life, if viewed as a means to an end, is a growth through the limitation of desire. The strength of a man is in his desires, but strength could not have been located at more precarious sources. For desires are so many and so imperious and so conflicting, that

as soon as they begin to act, a disintegrating process begins. We are broken up by our desires, and our powers scattered. Half the waste of college life goes this way. And when this danger of waste, or dissipation of energy, is over, another and greater danger lies in wait for us, the danger from competition. Some desire of a relatively low grade has gained the supremacy in our mind. The same desire has gained the supremacy in other minds. They meet, we will say, in the world of display. Desires upon the same grade must contend simply for degree. Display can be outdone only by more display. So the vulgarizing process goes on, the most humiliating feature of modern social life. Or they meet in the world of gain. It is still simply more. No matter what the competition is, the range of excellence is restricted to quantities and amounts.

It becomes evident that the only advantage which the man himself can get from his desires must come through some limitation of them. Unlimited, they waste his substance, his personal substance, and may make him an object of vulgar curiosity or contempt. Under proper limitations they remain the source of his essential strength.

But how shall one limit his desires? Certainly not by suppressing them. The world has had enough of that folly. There are really but two

ways; either by such concentration of desires upon a sufficient object that all desires are forced to lend their aid, or by such elevation of desire through the refinement of taste, the ennobling of ambition, the training of conscience, that all lower desires lose their place of power. But either one of these ways is gradual. Each represents a growth. More frequently perhaps than otherwise the advance comes as a reformation. We speak of men who have been delivered from the power of appetite and passion as reformed men. There are very few of us who do not need the cleansing of desires, the refining of tastes, the reforming of habits of thought and action to a degree equivalent to what is known in religious speech as conversion, if indeed it be not that very thing.

And I answer once more that every man's life, if viewed as a means to an end, is a search after truth. We lose a great deal of assumed and some real truth with the years. The volume of truth shrinks as we read it. A part of that which seemed to be true proves to be false, and more becomes unreal. Doubtless we throw away much truth with that which seems to be error. The critical habit of mind often lacks fairness and sometimes sanity. And the uncritical habit is more wasteful still. It debases the currency

through failure to maintain the standards. The result is that the average man among us is apt to grow poorer rather than richer in the most priceless of all possessions. I suppose that we seldom become aware of this change except as we are led in some way to feel at times our spiritual solitude. When truth is no longer familiar enough to us to serve us as a friend then are we indeed in solitary places. It must be hard for a man to die alone; it must be hard to die poor; it must be hardest of all to die unbefriended of truth: to feel that there is nothing certain, near, warm, as one enters the great mystery; to see no familiar object on the spiritual horizon, —

> "What time the white sail of the soul is rounding
> The mystic cape — the promontory Death."

The search after truth — I do not speak now of scientific or philosophic truth which has its own reward, but of moral truth within any man's reach — the search after truth is the most necessary of all the means to the ends of life. It is hard to conceive of one as having really lived in this world who has not possessed himself of its high realities. This is what the Scriptures say to us in ceaseless iteration; and this is what men say to us, who have anything to say which we care to hear.

And now what is the end to which faith, and decisive action, and controlled desire, and the search after truth are the means? What is the goal toward which we move through these great experiences which are possible to us in the right ordering of our lives? "Until we come" — St. Paul says — "unto a perfect man."

Is it not worth a man's while to set up in the days of his immaturity a self-government which will give him some assurance of maturity? Time can give us no such assurance. It may only make one's immaturity more obvious and painful. But it was not in God's intention, nor is it writ in the destiny of any man, that he should fail to arrive at full-grown manhood. I know the tremendous obstacles, I know the temptations which line the way, and the greater temptation within, but still I see the goal clear and shining, yes, transfigured. I left the sentence, which I quoted from St. Paul, broken and incomplete. I now go back to complete it. "Until we come . . . unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." I would not have you forget for a moment that the possibilities of our humanity have been realized in Christ, that every man of us may find in Him his own possible destiny. This is what Christianity means. This is its task. It does not shrink from its task nor stop

short of its end. It proposes to deal with us according to our capacity if we will give it room in our lives for its work. It promises nothing, absolutely nothing, to indifferent or careless, or to calculating and bargaining souls. But to men who speak to God in the terms of manhood He gives answer in the terms of manhood. You want to come to a full-grown man. You shall come, and when you shall have come, you will see for the first time the measure of your manhood, "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

## II

## THE ESTIMATION OF POWER

"And the three mighty men brake through the host of the Philistines, and drew water out of the well of Beth-lehem, that was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David: nevertheless he would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto the Lord." — 2 SAMUEL xxiii, 16.

THIS exquisite story, exquisite as we read it, was one of the many war stories of Israel. In the estimation of the time it was not one of the greatest. The narrator, who is giving the names of the chief of David's mighty men, and telling of their valorous deeds, says explicitly, that these mighty men were not of the first rank, and their deed, as he places it, is evidently not to be compared with that of one at least of a greater three who rose up against the Philistines and slew, and slew, and slew, till "his hand clave unto the sword."

And yet it is primarily a story of these mighty men, not of David. What he did is purely incidental. It is their valorous deed, not his sentiment, which stirs the imagination of the writer, and the imagination of his time. But not so with us. What David did has taken this story out of its time and setting, and carried it into other ages and among other peoples.

These things did these three mighty men, —

they "brake through the host of the Philistines, and drew water out of the well of Beth-lehem, that was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David: nevertheless he would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto the Lord."

David, of course, as chief among his mighty men, must have been mightier than they, with more deeds of a like sort to his credit, but might never could have made him anything more than a barbaric chief. It was his finer sense of power, his refusal to slake his thirst with the blood of his men, his sacrificial use of their valor, which made him fit to be a king. Sadly inconsistent this man was at times, and yet through all his career of violence and passion, there runs the constant sense of the sacredness of power, with the frequent expression of it in acts of mercy and sacrifice. We all feel the reality, as we feel the pathos, of the last words of this ruler of men, —

"David the son of Jesse saith,
And the man who was raised on high saith,
. . . . . .
The Rock of Israel spake to me:
One that ruleth over men righteously,
That ruleth in the fear of God,
He shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth,
A morning without clouds;
When the tender grass springeth out of the earth,
Through clear shining after rain.
Verily my house is not so with God;
Yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant,

Ordered in all things, and sure:
For it is all my salvation, and all my desire,
Although he maketh it not to grow."

It is the constant and gracious office of this old-time Biblical story as it enters each new generation, to remind men, wherever it can get a hearing, of the sacredness of power. Its office is correspondingly great and delicate as it enters any age of peculiar power. Therefore its place in our own age. It is becoming as hard for us to think sanely, to keep, that is, the true perspective, in the presence of our mighty men and their deeds, as it was for the age which saw the deeds of David and his mighty men. Almost any narrator of current events puts the emphasis about where this old-time narrator put the emphasis upon the events of his day. He took the first and easy measurements of power, — the number of foes a mighty man could slay between the rising of the sun and its setting. We exploit the market very much as he exploited the battlefield. How much money can be made between the rising and the setting of the sun? And yet we know that in the long, perhaps in the near retrospect, there will be marked changes in the valuation put upon the power of our age. It is one part of the business of educated men — men, that is, who are not foreshortening their vision — to anticipate

something of this later, clearer, more lasting judgment. I do not mean that the attitude of an educated man to his time should be merely judicial or critical. He is first, and of necessity, an actor, a producer, a winner, if you will, in the struggle. But he, of all men, ought to be able to keep the perspective, that he may not see only the things which are to grow dim in after times, that he may not miss the things which are to be resplendent in after times.

Hence the subject of which I wish to speak to you more at length — The Estimation of Power, the Power of your own Times.

I am not about to advise any premature judgment. Judgment follows knowledge, and knowledge is slow, and hard, and late, the outcome of humility, and patience, and charity. The single fact which I wish to impress upon you is the fact that power, the power of the world, is not something to be accepted just because it is power, but something to be estimated. And that I may urge this fact upon you with the greater distinctness, let me put you on your guard against the increasing tendency to reject power just because it is power. There are a great many people among us who are becoming afraid of the world. The number, I think, is increasing, and out of their fear grows much unwisdom of speech and action.

The greatest safeguard in all times of large and perhaps dangerous activity is discrimination. More and more people seem to be losing the power to discriminate. To their minds things which are vast and complex are necessarily evil. Likewise, things with which they are unfamiliar. A great many persons have not as yet become used to the modern world, and in its vastness and strangeness they suspect evil at every turn. Because it is so full of power, it must be, they reason, full of evil. I warn you against suspicion, or prejudice, or unintelligent apprehension, in respect to power, and in respect to powerful men. Let us never discriminate against the large in favor of the small, among men or among things. Discrimination goes with things and with men of a kind.

I urge upon you then the estimation of power, rather than the acceptance or rejection of it just because it is power. You cannot afford to be morally indifferent to the commanding forces of your time, and you cannot afford to ignore or escape them. They challenge your opinion. The safest thing that you can do is to accept the challenge. If you do not, if you decline to take sufficient moral account of the power of your time, it will certainly, though it may be unconsciously to yourselves, mould you to its type, and use you to its ends, so far as you may seem to be worth using.

I think that every one of us should approach the study of the power of his time in the spirit of true appreciation, if not of profound thankfulness. I can conceive of no greater calamity than to be born into a weak and spiritless age. Better by far the tumultuous and at times confusing life of an age like our own, with its intellectual adventure and its moral daring, than any age of petrified thought or of stagnant feeling, under whatever name of peace it may have been known. But the spirit of appreciation, or even of thankfulness for the endowment of our age, should not incline us to any indiscriminate acknowledgment of its power. So far as possible we should try to anticipate the judgment of later times. In that judgment, some things will come forth into clear view which are now overlooked, and other things which are now conspicuous will lose their relative significance. What of that judgment can we anticipate with any certainty in our present estimation of power? Naturally I call your attention to those things which are not at present most apparent.

The power of our time will be judged, I believe, far more than we are as yet aware, according to its restraints. The first thing men ask about is results; the second, the method by which they were gained. First, did he win the game? second, did he play fair? But the second question is sure

to be asked, and in the end is usually decisive. The advantage goes with the last word, and that always belongs to justice. In so diversified a matter as the power of an age, especially if its task be largely that of reconstruction, much allowance is made in respect to method. Departures from tradition, from the ordinary routine, from the established order, are acknowledged as inseparable from progress, but never a departure from justice. Even the ages which gave us religious and political liberty are not set free from this test. It was not to be expected that existing laws would be a complete and adequate expression of justice, under the sudden and almost overwhelming increase in the economic power of our age. Laws framed to meet other conditions would naturally be restrictive and possibly obstructive. But the law of a free land is after all the only safeguard for as well as against any sudden increase of power. Power of any kind must submit itself to the supreme test of restraint. Have we met the test? Partially. There has been, and there remains, a sufficient amount of unrestrained power to endanger the repute of our age in the final reckoning. Some men among us are simply intoxicated with power. Engaged in high ventures, they show no signs of mental sobriety. They are continually playing the game. Other men of very

different sort, sober-minded, sagacious, honorable, intent upon their enterprises, chafe and fret under restraints. Conscious of their integrity as they are of their power, they would be a law unto themselves, for what they believe to be the public good. And there are others still of an entirely different type, who in the furtherance of their selfish and greedy ambitions do not hesitate to attempt to subvert the law, and to try the integrity of the courts of justice.

I do not say that corruption of this last kind, or of any kind, is characteristic of the more powerful men of our time. What is becoming clear is the fact of their impatience of restraint, so that in your estimation of power, as you see it exemplified to-day, you must be prepared to qualify it by this moral limitation. The inference from this qualification is plain. Your generation will doubtless add a vast amount of power to this country. Do not allow yourselves to be satisfied with that prospect, or with the part which you may take in its fulfillment. The serious question before your generation is not, how much are you to add to the power of this country, but in what state are you to leave the country when you have done your work. Will its citizens be more or less law-abiding? Will the classes, for there are such already, be nearer together or further apart? Will

the church be freer, purer, more vital? Will the republic be more secure or less secure? The answer to these questions will depend in no considerable degree upon the estimation of power entertained by your generation, and particularly at this point of willingness to submit to the restraints of justice.

Another judgment which we must face, and which we do well to anticipate, is the judgment of power according to its refinements. When power has met the fair demands of law as expressing justice, it must go on to meet the demands of art as expressing the sincerity and fineness of the human spirit. Power which makes us violent or coarse, or vain, inflicts a really moral hurt. It wars against the soul. For art is one of the true and sincere ways in which the human spirit tries to find itself at its best. Very few of us are so foolish as to suppose that we see the world as it is, or men as they are. We know that we lack vision. We want the interpretation of the life which we see around us, and the discovery of that which seems afar off. We are continually asking for some one to tell us the meaning of the things we see, as we are always asking for some one to say the things we cannot utter, or to do the things which we are too timid or clumsy to attempt. The satisfaction of this craving is the ministry of art to the human spirit. "I remember," says

Emerson, "when in my younger days I had heard of the wonders of Italian painting I fancied the great pictures would be great strangers: some surprising combination of power and color: a foreign wonder. When at last I came to Rome and saw with eyes the pictures, I found that genius left to novices the gay and fantastic and ostentatious, and itself pierced directly to the simple and the true: that it was familiar and sincere: that it was the old eternal fact I had met in so many forms — unto which I lived. I now require of pictures that they domesticate me, not that they dazzle me." Such is the ministry of art to the human spirit, to "domesticate" us, to help us "to live on even terms with time," to bring the spirit and the senses into harmony.

In our estimation of power we cannot afford to overlook the test of art. So far as we observe or have experience, does the power of our age mock the spirit? Asking for bread, does it give bread or a stone? Does it employ the spirit rather than satisfy it? Or does power as we see its workings provide for the needs of the spirit, minister through various agencies to its culture, and afford the means for its satisfaction? It is difficult to say. The evidence is contradictory. When Thoreau graduated at Harvard sixty years ago he defended the thesis — "The world

is more beautiful than useful." Since that time the world has grown many times more useful. But utility is not the foe of beauty. The world is no less beautiful because more useful. The foe of art is vulgarity, display, vanity. These are the things which humiliate the spirit of man. It is difficult, I repeat, to say what is the effect of this atmosphere of power, in which we live and breathe, upon the finer attributes of the human soul. Sometimes it seems, as we watch the results of the processes of education, and social culture, and travel, and the increasing appreciation of the arts, as if we were as a people growing finer as well as stronger and richer; and then some outburst of vulgar display, representative apparently of some advanced type of social life, makes us pause and question. So that again, in our estimation of power we are obliged to qualify any superficial opinion we have formed. The very doubt throws us back upon our premise, — we cannot allow ourselves to accept power just because it is power.

There is still another judgment, most serious of all, to be passed upon the power of any age. The power of an age will be judged according to the presence or absence of the element of sacrifice. This is the clear and urgent lesson of the incident from which we started. Other lessons which we

have drawn are suggested by it: this lies at its heart, power redeemed, transfigured by sacrifice. The heroic offering of these mighty men was too costly to be accepted for the end which prompted it. There was but one end which could match the deed—its sacrificial use. "And David poured it out unto the Lord."

The condition of this old story is continually repeating itself. The question comes again and again to a man, to a nation, to an age. Shall the water drawn from the well of Bethlehem which is by the gate be taken to slake one's own thirst, or the thirst of others, through its gift unto the Lord? This I say is the test by which every age of power must be judged,—will it spend the best which it has upon itself, or will it send on something of its best to the ages which may follow? Let us not miss the real significance of the alternative. The spirit of sacrifice has no equivalent. There is the spirit of thrift through which the savings of one generation may become the property of another. The spirit of thrift may work to the advantage of others, but it is not the spirit of sacrifice. There is the spirit of self-denial, through which one loses that he may gain, giving up the lower for the higher, luxury for efficiency. Every virile race has been such because of self-denial, from the Hebrew brought

up on the "Thou shalt not" of the commandments to the Samurai trained under the moral discipline of Bushido. But the spirit of self-denial is not of necessity the spirit of sacrifice. The essence of sacrifice is the gift of the costliest. Self-sacrifice is the gift of one's self, because nothing means so much to a man as himself. Sacrifice means the refusal to use the rich endowments, and the high promises, and the large opportunities, and the costliest gains for personal ends. It is these refusals which carry power over from one age to another, and give it abiding honor.

In any attempt you may make to analyze the power of your age, you should not fail to give a rightful place to the element of sacrifice. If the power of an age is chiefly an earning and a spending power, no matter how vast may be its earnings, nor how vast may be its expenditures, it will not put much on deposit for after ages.

I do not know, it is impossible for any one to tell, how much the benevolence of our time expresses sacrifice; but this much is beginning to be evident, namely, the disposition to throw off many just demands on personal benevolence upon rich men simply because they are rich. In remarking upon the proposal that a religious denomination should invite a certain rich man to

provide for its aged and indigent ministers, the New York "Times" exclaims: "There it is, the expectation fast coming to a stern demand, that any neglected duty of a public or semi-public, or charitable or semi-charitable sort, shall be assumed, not by those who voluntarily incur and are entirely able to perform it if they choose, but by the millionaire, the one person to whom the performance of the duty is so easy, so entirely free from any element of self-sacrifice, that it makes a wholly insignificant item on the credit side of his account of things well or ill done. Of course the millionaire has his own large duties to perform, but there is difficulty in seeing that they include the pauperization of solvent corporations, or committees, or individuals." I have frequently had occasion to call your attention to the increasing proportion of the graduates of our colleges who enter the gainful callings rather than the callings which lead straight to service. The direct giving of self certainly does not match the widening opportunity. Why do young men go to the city? Because they heed the alluring invitations of the city, not because they hear the cry of the city. And as respects duties which are national in their scope, like the lifting of burdens which, if not borne to-day, will fall with crushing weight on the next generation, I am not sure that we are

acting even with a just responsibility. I have in mind, as I speak, the duty of the whole nation to the colored race in the South, which is so fast becoming a duty of the nation to its own future. I can understand many of the difficulties which hedge our way, but I cannot understand our hesitancy where the way is open, the duty confessed, and the present result such as to justify the largest investment in the training of a race.

I will not multiply illustrations. All that I have wanted to show you at this point as at previous points is the need of understanding the power of your age so that you be not awed or misled by it. The premise of my argument, I make it the refrain of my sermon, is, you cannot afford to accept or reject power, just because it is power. You must estimate it. In trying to help you to some right estimation of the power of your time, I have called in certain standards, the constants of christian civilization, by which every age is tested, — law, art, and the religious spirit as expressed in sacrifice. These are not all, but they are well-recognized claimants in behalf of the human soul in every age of power. If their claims are not heeded, they enter their protest against the age which spurns them. And they have their sure revenge. The revenge of the human soul, when its rights are ignored by power, is history.

I remind you again that it is the business of the educated man to anticipate with some accuracy, in his estimation of the power of his age, the clear and final judgment of his kind. And I remind you still further that the personal attitude of a man to the world depends upon the value which he puts upon the power of the world. If the things of sense are more to him than the things of the spirit he will try to get them at the cost of the things of the spirit. If you really want money more than you want honesty you will be pretty sure to get money at the price of honesty. A man's desires are terrible things to trifle with. When a man loses the balance of reason we say that he is mentally insane. When a man loses the balance of his desires he becomes morally insane. Therefore Jesus says to men in his mighty wisdom, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Keep then the balance, keep the proportion, keep the perspective. Start in with righteousness and you shall come out with your nation great, your cities safe, your corporations strong, your social life clean, your personal lives honorable in the sight of all men.

# III

## WISDOM THE PRINCIPAL THING

"Wisdom is the principal thing: therefore get wisdom: yea with all thy getting get understanding." — PROVERBS iv, 7.

THERE is to my mind a certain inherent ugliness in the word "get," and it is not above reproach in some of its associations, but we shall all agree that it is one of the most characteristic words of our language. It pervades our common speech with the force of a race word. All the initiative, the acquisitiveness, the pride of possession which mark the Anglo-Saxon find expression in this homely syllable. It is not to be wondered at that our translators have used it frequently in the transfer of thought from the terse and sinewy Hebrew.

I have called your attention to this word because it gives so much strength and movement to my text. This old-time writer is speaking about wisdom, but not in any abstract or academic way. He speaks of it just as if it were something to be found in the market place or in the field. I shall try to speak to you in this same spirit concerning wisdom. My subject is the present call to wisdom, the call to you out of your generation. I

shall try to show you that at this time — under present conditions of private and public life — "wisdom is the principal thing;" and in attempting to do this I hope to be able to say to each one of you, through every sentence which I utter, "therefore get wisdom: yea with all thy getting get understanding."

Of course this insistence upon the getting of wisdom means that wisdom can be acquired. Doubtless some men are born with a greater capacity or aptitude for it than others, but wisdom is not an endowment. Neither is it entirely a matter of experience. It is chiefly an acquisition, something to be gained in greater or less degree by all men as they give the rightful place to it among the powers which ought to belong to them in their maturity. Some men are foolish because they do not care to be wise. Some men lack wisdom because they do not take time to be wise. Some men fail to be nobly wise through cowardice, the constant and most serious foe to wisdom. But all the while wisdom is something to be had through desire, through patient seeking, through courageous action.

All this will become plain to you if I can rightly interpret the present call to wisdom, the call of your generation. The cry of the past generation, especially of the past decade, has been

for efficiency. We have asked everywhere and unceasingly for the efficient man, meaning thereby the man of results. We have striven in all possible ways to produce him. School, and shop, and street have been in close competition toward this end. We have gained our end. We have produced the efficient man, the man capable of results, able to show his power not in one but in many ways. The most conspicuous type, the man of vast fortune, exists because other men of efficiency are at work with him, and for him, and unto him. But now that we have the efficient man and the results due to him, we are not quite easy or safe in his presence, nor are we as sure of the results which he has given us as we would like to be. And yet we do not want to lower our standard of efficiency, we do not wish to produce a feebler or less effective man. We do not care to change the proportions of life with which we have become familiar, and return to a world of scant equipment and of hesitant forces. It would be the merest cant on our part to pray for adversity in place of the growing resources and the enlarging opportunities of our time. What we really want is security, confidence, satisfaction concerning the things we have, and concerning our way of getting them, and a more satisfying sense than we now have that we are really getting the best things. I think

that we are beginning to be willing to pay the price of these assurances. At any rate we have come to the stage of reflection, and are unwilling to trust ourselves any longer to the arbitrary and unregulated power of the merely efficient man. Hence the unmistakable call to wisdom where once we heard nothing but the cry for efficiency.

As the call is new, this call to you of your generation, let me try to interpret it to you in some of its deeper meanings. I do not believe that it is the call of mere caution or fear. I do not recognize in it the voice of a traditional conservatism which is always in protest at the rate of progress. I do not detect in it the accents of a worldly wisdom, which is indifferent to principles, afraid only of consequences. It seems to me to be at its best a brave, honest, believing call, a veritable call of the spirit in men to the spirit in men: otherwise I would not repeat it in your presence or try to interpret it to your understanding.

Let me say then, in the first place, that it seems to me to be one of the many and oft-repeated calls to righteousness, taking now the form of a challenge to the mind, especially to the trained mind, to the end of its own freedom. There have been ages in which the greatest danger to righteousness lay in passion, sometimes in morbid and degenerate passion. There have been ages in

which the greatest danger to righteousness lay in bigotry, in the narrowing and hardening of conscience in the assumed interest of truth. The chief danger to righteousness in our time lies in the perversion of the intellect. Too many men among us are selling their minds in the market place. Wrong schemes prosper in many cases because they are devised or carried out by men of brains in the employ of men of will. In some instances subordinates are guilty of practices which their principals would not commend. The desire, for example, of a manager to make a good showing in the business must be under the control of both honesty and justice, else there will be harm done to those below him, or injury to the business itself. I put you on your guard against the bartering of the mind for any supposable returns in position or in money. The real return, the actual reward in every such case, is servitude.

In saying this I do not dissuade you from putting your talents at the service of men of accumulated power, or at the service of corporations. The presumption is in favor of integrity in the business world. If you enter this world you have the right to that presumption. But in any particular case, if you find that you have been deceived, the sooner you part company with a dishonest or unjust man, or with a dishonest or

unjust corporation, the better for you. You cannot afford the inevitable result of such service — servitude. On the other hand, identification with a man, or house, or corporation of honorable record, of clean and humane methods, and of satisfying enterprise ought to call out your unfailing loyalty and your unstinted effort. You can afford to put into such service whatever mental power you have, in the assurance of the appreciation of the highest result of your power, namely, mental rectitude. The present call to wisdom is nothing less than a challenge to the mind of your generation to preserve its moral freedom. Can you think of a nobler call? Is it not as noble a thing to keep the mind free from the slavery of dishonesty, as it is to keep it free from the slavery of superstition or bigotry? Yet we applaud the men and the ages which fought for this kind of freedom, and passed on their victory. Do not ignore or deny the challenge of your age to mental freedom, through mental rectitude, in the presence of the enslaving power of corrupt wealth. Make it easier, not more difficult, for your sons, and for all men who may come after you, "to do justly, to love mercy," yes, and "to walk humbly with God," not meanly and cringingly with men, but humbly with God.

This new call to wisdom is then, to begin with,

a call to self-respecting independence. It strikes at once the note of freedom. It strikes perhaps a deeper note as it recalls the mind of your generation to its obligation to truth. If the first note is freedom the second is loyalty. We have fallen upon a singular and in some cases glaring inconsistency in the material development of our time. This material development is based upon scientific truth, the first condition of which is mental honesty. The whole process of scientific training, with all the results consequent upon it, has involved from first to last this quality. It has been a costly training, costly in the amount and character of the instruction required, costly in its equipment, costly through the insistence which it has placed upon the trustworthiness of the results demanded. This training toward scientific truth has been costly also in some of its incidental effects. Wherever it has been adopted and applied outside the natural or physical sciences, as in the realm of history, or philosophy, or theology, it has changed opinions of men and of events, it has revolutionized theories, it has modified religious beliefs. It has cost many men very much to accept these changes in inherited opinions, in established and working theories, and in personal belief, but they have accepted them loyally and unflinchingly in the interest of truth. The critical

habit of the age, which has wrought such changes elsewhere in the interest of truth, has paused and grown hesitant, and ineffective, and cowardly before the material development which it has done so much to set in motion. The methods of building up and expanding great business enterprises have not been subjected to the same tests which have been applied unsparingly by critics, and bravely accepted by all who have been concerned with scientific investigation, with historical research, or with religious beliefs. The inconsistency is, as I have said, singular and glaring. At the very point where the scientifically trained mind might have been expected to assert its morality, just where it has to do with material values affecting human life, it has failed. It has tolerated shams, it has jockeyed with values, it has devised and executed frauds: and in so far as it has done, or allowed the doing of any of these things, it has been disloyal to its own training. It is inconsistent to create a value through all the scrupulously exact processes of its creation, and then to give it commercial license. We must learn to handle material values with the same care which we exercise in creating them. We cannot afford to have one standard of honesty in the creation of wealth, and another standard in the manipulation of wealth. The inconsistency is grievous. The pre-

sent call to wisdom is therefore in part a recall of the trained mind of your generation to its constant and continuous obligation to truth. There is no point at which it can decline its obligations, and remain a factor in the productive power of the world. So long as it concerns itself primarily with material values, it must guarantee them to the public. This is a fair demand. Speaking in behalf of those whose business it is to train the mind to efficiency, I accept, in all which it implies, this demand that it be trained to morality.

I give you one further thought in the interpretation of the present call to wisdom. First, as we have seen, this call is a challenge to the trained mind to a self-respecting independence; then it is a summons to the mind to a consistent morality; and now at last it makes its appeal to the mind for unselfish forethought. There is no form of the call to wisdom which is more serious than the protest it utters against the selfishness of living in and for the present. It is the protest which above all protests we need to hear. We belong to an age which lives in and for itself. The spirit of the age is infectious. All things are saying to us, every man is saying to his neighbor, "Live in the now, live to the full." The world is just now so rich and splendid, so full of desirable things, that it does not seem as if it

could always, or for long time, be held in possession. Men recall the poor, and scanty, and struggling periods which have had their place in the history of every people. Many a man recalls a yet nearer time in his own experience of want, and hardship, and unrewarding toil. The contrast with the abundant rewards and relieving methods which are now his, enhances the value of every day in the life of the present. And who knows what is to come? Who can date the return of the hard economies, the severe virtues, the struggle for existence? Who can declare even the law of diminishing returns? Who can forecast the economic changes, the social reversals, the limitations upon the national supremacy, which may give us the environment of another kind of world? So men question within themselves; and so they reason toward the practical conclusion, "Let us seize the present; let us live in the day."

No observant or sensitive man can fail to see or to feel this intense eagerness to live in the present. It explains in part the quickening of the pace in education. Education is becoming more and more a means to some immediate end. The end is so near, so tangible, so tempting, why stop on the way for the enrichment of the mind or the enlargement of desires? The scholar who

is to become a teacher, even in the higher grades, is quite as much in haste as, and often more ready to abridge his training than, his fellow student preparing for the law, for medicine, or for the ministry. This same eagerness to live in and for the present is more manifest still in its effect upon social life, especially upon the life of the home. The children of the rich are put out earlier and earlier because the home can no longer make suitable provision for them, and at the same time keep up the social round of exciting and exhausting pleasures. The home of the old New England families is no longer charged with the spirit of sacrifice which once characterized it. Children are not so much as formerly an investment. Something of the money which once sent boys to college goes into the cheap luxuries of the house. I make no sweeping statement at this point, but the difference between the former and later times is brought out by the social sacrifices of the newer peoples who are beginning to appropriate the old New England custom of making the children of the home the great investment, — the mark of unselfish forethought.

I do not dwell upon the innumerable signs of this eagerness to live in and for the present in the business world. We expect to find much of it there. There is more immaturity in the busi-

ness world than anywhere else, and on the whole I think that it lasts longer with the individual man. As a very sagacious observer recently said, the proportion of failures, absolute failures, is nowhere else so great. Failures, however, are not to be deplored so much as successes which prejudice the future, as when markets which have been fairly won are lost by cheapening the product; successes which are gained at the expense of the public through corrupt or fraudulent practices, and successes, most despicable of all, which destroy life, which make the poverty of the poor their destruction. There is no complaint of our time so just as the complaint against indifferent wealth.

The call, then, of wisdom to men, whoever they may be, who are living too much in and for the present, is a straight appeal to their unselfishness; and the unselfishness of the mind is best expressed in foresight. It says to the man who really proposes to give himself to others, who aspires to one of the self-denying callings, but who is in haste to be about his business: "See to it that in giving yourself you make a sufficient gift. Enlarge yourself, enrich yourself, refine your power. Be not content with the spirit of giving. Have much to give."

It says to the home, "Give freely of self, not

over much of money, to your children. Anticipate the needs of men which may be met and satisfied through them. Train them for service, equip them for it, yes, consecrate them to it, if need be, by your sacrifice."

It says to the street, "Be honest, that the nation may live, that the social order may be preserved, that the good name of the people may be exalted among the peoples of the earth. Make your gift to the future as much as you will in money, but more in honor."

Now in this call to wisdom out of your own generation, as I have interpreted it to you, is there anything irrational, cowardly or merely prudential? Is it not, as I said at the beginning, a brave, honest, believing call, the call of the spirit in men to the spirit which is in you? I do not say that it is a recall from efficiency to morality. I say rather that it is a call to morality without which there can be no more efficiency. Unless we can make the efficient man moral, he has already become useless.

I have been speaking of the present call to wisdom as a special call to the trained mind of your generation. It has to do with all men everywhere, but it is most insistent and urgent wherever it can get a hearing among men of trained power. To you, and to men like you all over the land, it

is saying, "Do not sell your minds. Self-respecting independence is above price. A man is of no value to himself who is not free.

"Be consistent in the use of mental power. Never discharge your minds of their obligation to the truth. At whatever stage you deal with material values, deal honestly.

"Do not live in the selfish employment of the present. Think, plan, work, sacrifice for the future. Be sure that something about you that you have said, or done, or suffered goes over into the service and remembrance of men."

Thus interpreted is not the ancient word true to-day; so true that no man can deny its premises nor evade its conclusion, — "Wisdom is the principal thing: therefore get wisdom: yea with all thy getting get understanding."

# IV

## THE UNEARNED INCREMENT IN MODERN LIFE

"I say unto you, That unto every one which hath shall be given." — LUKE xix, 26.

I ARREST the saying of Jesus at this point that we may fix our minds upon the growing import of these particular words. I would withhold your thought, for the time, from the conclusion of the saying — "from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him"; for, relatively, the first part of this saying has a far wider application to-day than the second part.

The moral significance of modern life is not found in any easy contrast between gain and loss. It is still terrible to watch the relentless process of diminution which is going on in many communities, the diminution sometimes of estate, sometimes of personality itself, affecting both individuals and families. But the process of gain, almost as inevitable as that of loss, which is going on all around us, is becoming more and more startling in its effect upon individual and social life. This process has about it many of the characteristics of a physical law. In the impersonality of its working, in its absolute indifference to the indi-

vidual, it may bring forces to bear upon him over which he has no sufficient control, and overwhelm him with gains of which he is not the master.

In fact the conditions of modern life, whether you apply the term modern to democracy or to civilization or to Christianity, open the way to unlimited gains on the part of the individual. The vast majority living under these conditions have so much — are so well born, that is, and trained, and in many ways endowed — that much more must be given to them, not earned by them, but given to them. The process is at work, as I have said, with startling effect in many cases. It works with the inevitableness of law. "Unto every one that hath shall be given." He cannot escape the gain. Expressed in terms of current speech, the moral danger which besets us is from the unearned increment in modern life.

We have, of course, the most evident result of this process within the region of wealth, where we now have a class, a very large class, from whose lives the element of struggle has been entirely eliminated, and even the element of ordinary care. The struggle for existence is too remote to be conceived of. There is no outlet for activity or invention except in amusement.

Another evident result is to be seen within the region of knowledge, where we have a very much

larger class whose general intelligence is out of all proportion to the effort on their part to acquire knowledge. A very little education with no approach to learning brings the whole world of ideas and facts to any one's door; and out of the confusion of this almost impersonal kind of intelligence we have to evolve public opinion, which for this reason is still so often merely a moral or immoral sentiment, not an intellectual conclusion. It is not the result of any verified information nor even of reflection.

And still another result is to be seen within the region of morals and religion, where we have greatly extended the range of what may be termed reputation, or accepted character. The church, with its old sharp distinction of membership, finds itself in the presence of the Christianized, or at least, moralized, community.

Of course, the action of this law of gain becomes less definite and certain as you pass from the outward to the inward life, but it is at work everywhere. This, I say, is the peculiar significance of modern society. The change is so significant that we must learn to adjust ourselves to it morally. We used to say that the stream of life ran against the individual. We used to tell him that if he dropped his oar, or lessened his stroke, the current would sweep him down. We cannot say that

any longer to a great many persons, perhaps not to the average person. The social current is with him. It is carrying some along, as we have seen, with no effort on their part, and others with no effort which can take the name of strenuousness. The really strenuous life is far below, down where the struggle for existence is going on, or far beyond, if not above, out in the hot competitions of the world, or remote from both in those solitary places where men have learned to think patiently, or to act with resolution and sacrifice.

I am intent upon the adjustment of our moral ideas and actions to this change of situation which we are now considering. We are still concerned with the man who has not, from whom even that which he hath is being taken away. But we need to be more concerned than heretofore with the man who has, to whom it shall be given. That person is in the midst of us. He is any one of us. What shall we say to him, what shall a man say to himself as he begins to be conscious upon reflection that he is more in danger from the certainty of gain than from the possibility of loss?

I will try to be as definite as possible in the answer to this question. I begin by reminding you how close is the moral connection between all outward gain and personal effort. Personal effort may make the gain absolutely immoral if

the end or the method be bad, but usually personal effort is the chief moral safeguard in the process of gain. We do not reckon the moral risk as great in the making of a fortune as in the inheriting of a fortune. The danger in the latter case is that the moral connection between possession and work will be broken. The inheritor of a fortune may put as much of his better self into the administering of it, as his predecessor put of his better self into the making of it; or (he alone has the alternative) he may squander and dissipate it with the inevitable reaction upon his own character. The danger is so great that it is always a matter of surprise when a fortune passes through three or four generations and leaves the moral strength of a family unimpaired.

Apply the same test to the inheritance of knowledge or of the means of knowledge. One enters college, the place of his intellectual inheritance. What will he do there? Will he keep or will he break the moral connection between possession and work? I always think of this as the supreme moral question in any one's college course. A college represents the means of knowledge within easy possession. It stands for the long gains of thought, for the constant proving of methods, for the accumulation of the agencies and instruments of knowledge, for the presence

of guides, helpers, and friends. As is often said, no one can go through college without gaining much from his associations. What he gets in this way is the unearned increment of his life. Is that enough, if that be all, to satisfy the situation morally? Is that enough to offset the moral deterioration that is always going on when one is working below his powers? Can one afford to take the risk of four years of infidelity to duty, of indifference to work, of contempt for ambition? Can he afford to take the risk of becoming a shirk or a cheat, because something must come to him, through his associations, do what he will, neglect what he will? Do you not see that the great morality of college life centres just where the morality of all modern life centres, around this question of the correspondence between work and possession?

Is there any better test than this of the morality of modern Christianity? What is the difference between the nominal christian and the real christian? The nominal christian is the person who lives altogether upon the gains of Christianity. To the extent to which he is a christian, he can hardly help being a christian. His Christianity is purely a matter of assent, or rather of the absence of denial. It is practically necessary today for a man to do something, or write some-

thing, which may put some anti-christian label upon him, to be reckoned as other than a christian man. The real christian is the man who puts something of himself into his Christianity, who contributes something of himself to the common Christianity. The range of action here is very wide: it runs far beyond all conventional limits; it includes all whom Dr. Bushnell used to designate as the "outside saints." But it falls within the principle, which we are now explaining, that there must be a proper correspondence between personal effort of some kind and possession, to give moral value to one's possessions. There is just as much moral danger from religion, where religion is made too easy, as from any of the greater things which to-day are given to men.

But our question has a much wider outlook. If "unto every one that hath shall be given," what is the source of the gift, whence comes the gain? Is it impersonal or personal? Are there those who represent in any special way the earning power of the generation, or who control its gains? I think that you will agree that in making this inquiry we touch upon the most manifest inconsistency of our time. We assume that we represent the nearest approach to equality which the world has seen, and yet there never was a time when power of every kind, which makes for gain,

was at such a remove from the many. Very few people control the property which they own, further than to shift it from one investment to another. The most advanced thinking must be done by those who have the special means and appliances for investigation. And the best action of the world, so far as it is organized, is carried on by those who have committed themselves to some specialized activity. The modern saint is about as highly specialized as the modern scholar. The control of affairs, the determination of thought, the maintenance of sentiment, are with the few, not with the many. In fact, so marked is this peculiarity of modern life that it raises a distinct moral issue of its own, which we cannot ignore.

We have been speaking about the moral attitude of a man to his own work, and the part which he ought to take in the gainful process which is going on about him, and ministering to him, if he is to have any moral value in his possessions. But side by side with this question lies the question of one's moral attitude to those who are at work for him, who are doing the work he cannot do, who are making his gains, the effect of which is of mighty concern to him. Let us look into the matter a little. Certainly more than half the property of this community is not under its immediate control. If a man receives a divi-

dend, he does not know how far it represents honest and how far dishonest gain, whether any part of it stands for unrequited labor or untaxed value. He cannot guarantee it to his conscience. And what is true of property is true of many of those interests which go to make up that part of ourselves which lies outside our personal control. Have we then no responsibility, no moral obligations, in this outer region of possession and interest? No one would say that. But what we all feel is that our moral force, if not our moral sense, is largely undeveloped in this direction. We seem to lose moral discernment as we pass from personal conduct into the social order.

President Hadley quoted recently the opinion of an English economist to the effect that the standard of personal morality in America is decidedly higher than in England, that of commercial morality probably a little lower, and that of political morality quite distinctly lower, — an opinion which he indorsed and enforced by adding that we, as a people, do not yet know what virtues must be exercised for the maintenance of organized society, as well as we know what virtues are necessary to the harmonious living of individuals among their neighbors. As any one can see, we have not yet learned how to apply moral power far beyond the range of our per-

sonal actions. We do not know how to act with dignity and authority toward those who have more to do with the outward concerns of our lives, than we have to do with them ourselves. At present we are in the stage of captious criticism, complaint, and protest. This is always a transient, a preliminary stage. The moral outcome must be positive. It will become positive, but the present condition shows us how much we have to do to reach this result.

I do not know that we are in the habit of thinking that the moral behavior of people, especially religious people, toward those who represent the intellectual earnings of the time, is a part of the same moral immaturity. I have said that the most advanced thinking must be done by those who have the means and appliances for investigation. But the majority of good people are still afraid of investigation. They have forced the church, even in our time, into some ignoble positions. It is always ignoble to be obliged to surrender to truth in the form of intellectual progress. But such a surrender is no infrequent occurrence. Soon or late, the church acknowledges its scholars and thinkers. Soon or late, it acknowledges all scholars and thinkers who make their contribution to truth. Better, would it not be, the spiritual insight or the spiritual courage

which anticipates, if it cannot fully welcome, the inevitable result? It will always stand to the credit of Mr. Moody, a sign of his moral maturity, that he was not afraid of the fellowship of Henry Drummond and George Adam Smith.

Carry the thought into a still higher region. Consider how separate and distinct, how remote the most of us are, from the valiant and sacrificing workers in the world. Here and there among us there is the relation of personal intimacy or of material and moral support, but how rarely is the relation so well established as to allow any return of spiritual quickening. The actual remoteness of the more heroic lives and their work seems to increase with the means of communication with them. When Benjamin Snow, a graduate of Bowdoin, and his wife, went out to Micronesia to begin their marvelous work for the redemption of the people of those islands, they were at a year's remove by mail, and yet they and their work were followed by multitudes in this country whose lives were visibly affected by their heroism. Now we are in daily communication with all the heroic work of the world, but there is very little moral intimacy with any part of it, not enough to get the spiritual reaction from it. If any valiant soul falls, or if his cause perishes, the fact makes only a momentary im-

pression upon us. And yet we know that if a thousand of the most self-denying and self-sacrificing men and women among us should give over their work, a darkness would fall upon the land, which no light of learning could disperse. They are necessary to us, they represent the unearned spiritual increment of our lives. But we fail to make any moral contact with them. How many of us, I repeat, know any brave, self-denying, inspiring work with such interest that we should miss it out of our lives if it should fail? Are we not conscious that we are living, for the most part, in the moral commonplace, when the world is full of moral quickenings for us, if we knew how to come under their power?

I am speaking altogether with the intent of pointing out the state of moral irresponsibility in which we live, so far as that part of our lives is concerned, in which the greatest material gains may be taking place, or in which the greater moral possibilities lie. I am trying to show you that this is the condition of modern life, a condition in which we have not yet made ourselves at home morally. Modern life appears to be open, accessible in every part, full of appliances for bringing men and peoples into close and vital contact. Really modern life is a thoroughly organized system of assumed and delegated powers, of

separate functions, of distinct and remote spheres of action. It is very hard to act with moral efficiency outside the routine of our daily duty. It is difficult to understand those who represent the advanced thought of the time, to understand them well enough not to fear them. It is difficult to come near enough to the noble and more saintly lives about us to catch inspiration from them. Here is the perplexity, the inconsistency of modern life. Our gains come to us from apparently inaccessible sources. The problem before us is twofold: first, how to invade this outer world where our material gains lie, to make sure that they are honest gains; and then, how to get access to it on the spiritual side, to make sure of direct spiritual results. The problem is not altogether new. It has always existed, — Christ summed it up in one of his great sayings: "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." And the best and bravest souls of all time have tried to act according to the meaning of this saying. They have tried with one consent to maintain the mighty struggle for personality in the midst of possession.

"Even in a palace life may be led well."

I will not pause to suggest any secondary ways in which we may fitly try to meet our difficulties.

The essential way seems to me to lie in the remaining thought which I would urge. If we are to maintain ourselves morally, if we are to act with moral efficiency in the midst of so great outward gains, we must restore and cultivate the ancient christian art of losing. The inconsistency and perplexity of our condition are met by the paradox which Christ loved to repeat: "He that will save his life shall lose it, and he that will lose his life for my sake shall save it," — a saying which Paul caught up and interpreted in his own life, "What things were gain to me, these I counted loss for Christ"; "for" meaning here by reason of, or for the sake of. By reason of, because Christ had made the things to be given up of inferior value. Christian losing is never wasting. It rests upon change of values. It means the surrender of the lower to the higher, the less to the greater, the thing we have come to care less for, to the thing we now care more for. Christianity implants the better desire, and then says — not till then — adjust your ambitions and purposes to that.

Apply the principle to the gains from the material world. Your desires are for money. Money is the first thing to you in the world, money, that is, as it stands for ease or position or power. How are you, with such a desire, going to demand

honesty and justice on the part of those who, at a remove from you, control your money? You want large returns. That means indifference to the means of gain. The greed which countenances dishonesty is by no means confined to those of large possessions. Dishonesty rests upon the spirit of greed which is in all our hearts. When we all want honesty more than we want large returns with some possible dishonesty, we shall have honesty. We shall have the thing we want most, and shall oblige others to give us the thing which we want most.

The real moral work of to-day, then, lies in the training of desires; this is the moral part of education. If education simply trains men to become more skillful in taking away from their fellows the largest share of lower things, then education has become a great immorality.

I quote from a letter which recently fell under my notice, written to a benefactor of education. "Now and then," says the writer, "quite possibly too often, I find floating through my mind doubts about the purely moral value of so much education as is now being provided for. Nearly every time I mix in business affairs, I have the fact forced upon my observation that college graduates are quite as dishonest and expert sharpers as their less fortunate and more igno-

rant brothers. I fear that I am gradually becoming forced to the adoption of a new motto, — Fewer churches, less learning, and more honesty. How do you like it?" That was the impatient, half-earnest word of a well-known lawyer, a gallant soldier and reformer, and a lover of books beyond most scholars.

The moral end of education is the education of desires, helping men, compelling them to want higher things. Suppose there should come into the mind of people at large a change of values, not as the result of depression or adversity, but because there had come a new sense of the value of the things of the spirit. Men are not dishonest as touching the things which are above them, only as touching the things which are below them. What if the mind of this people should be lifted if only by a little, what if ambitions born above the plane of materialism should become the controlling ambitions? What chance would dishonesty, great or small, have in such atmosphere? Is it impossible to make our method of education work to this end, — the enrichment of the common life through the ennobling of desires?

But we will not overestimate the moral power of education. There is a mightier power. Paul said that he counted his gain as loss, not only because Christ had brought new value into his

life, but also because Christ had put a new motive into his life. "The life I now live I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Christianity comes into modern life not only with its change of value, but also with its great and sufficient motives. This is still the meaning of personal Christianity, of what I called, a little while ago, real Christianity. The following of the personal Christ at any time, be it small or be it large, is made up of those whose hearts are touched with gratitude. They are conscious that Christ has done something for them. "Who, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich."

Let us not, however, mistake the meaning of the following of Christ. We begin to follow Him because touched by gratitude; we continue to follow Him that we may learn the secret of his life. Now the open secret of the life of Christ was the sharing of all which was his, and of himself, with humanity. I remember that Dr. Dale of Birmingham once said that it seemed to him as if Christ felt that his own fortune was bound up in the fortune of the human race. That feeling made a heaven unshared impossible to him. That made the incarnation necessary.

The following of Christ is taking his fortune,

whose fortune is that of the human race. We cannot follow Christ and get away from those who, if He were here, would throng his way, if they did not crowd his churches. "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto the least of these, my brethren, ye did it not unto me." We cannot share our gains with them and be very far from Him. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these, my brethren, ye did it unto me."

We do not follow Christ by denying ourselves knowledge, or strength, or money. Christ was wise, strong, and rich, — "who for our sakes became poor." If He had been poor and weak and ignorant, He could have done nothing for us. There is no such thing as personality devoid of all the sources of personal power. First enlarge and ennoble your own personality as far as you can toward "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ," and then go on your way to meet those from whom there is being taken away even that which they have. So will you do something to recover the ancient christian art of losing, making that art at once rational and persuasive.

I rejoice that you are to enter into one of the strong and full generations of the world. Some of you will have a large share of its strength and fullness. None of your lives will be scant and meagre by the standard of other times. Whatever you

may seem to yourselves to lack, never for a moment be envious of any whom you may come to know, upon whom power of any kind has been thrust in coarse abundance. There is no slavery so great as that into which one falls who is possessed by wealth, wealth which the owner is incapable of using as capital. On the other hand, put a right valuation on power of every kind which you can use to honorable and satisfying ends. And in your estimates of useful power give sufficient thought to your own personality. In the midst of all the abounding strength of the world, the cry is going up on every side, from street and from hearth, for men and women courageous, joyous, and efficient, unselfishly efficient. I do not like to think of any christian virtue as being at any time ineffective, but if we had the mediæval saints among us, I do not know just what we should do with them. Let us not be afraid of our own generation. Let us not be betrayed by its standards. But keeping the mastery of our souls, let us take its gains and learn how "to count them loss for Christ."

# V

## PROFESSIONAL VALUES

"And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, call not thou common." — Acts x, 15.

The word of rebuke may be the word of honor. To single out a man and say to him — "Whatever other men may say or do, you are to say or do the better thing" — is at once an acknowledgment of his power and a challenge to his faith. Peter, you will recall, was educated chiefly by this process. So long as Jesus held him under personal training he was continually rebuking him, smiting his weaknesses, restraining his waywardness, trying, to use Peter's own words, "to stablish, strengthen, settle" him, in order that he might justify in fact what Christ had set before him in promise, — "Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, a rock." And now Jesus had gone away, and in place of his personal presence there was the new faith, the new order, which men were to call Christianity. Peter was its foremost representative. Could he represent it, in its breadth, in its freedom, in its impartial humanity? Peter was just beginning to be a christian. Would he relapse into Judaism, and carry the new faith

back with him? The test came at the point of the inclusiveness of Christianity. Was it to open its doors to every man, or was it to close them against the stranger, the alien, the Gentile? Peter hesitated. The old distinctions were dominant in his mind. How could he, first a Jew and then a christian, receive strangers, outsiders, aliens, and eat with them? How could he compromise himself by contact with the common and unclean? There was need of the same method which Christ had used so often. Hence the word of the Vision, as if it were the well-known word of the Master, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." Let others, if they must, abide in their narrowness. Stand thou forth in the freedom of the christian man. The very fortune of Christianity, as you see, was apparently dependent upon the attitude of Peter to the outside humanity. And in turn his attitude was dependent upon his sense of the worth of that humanity. If that was still common and unclean in his eyes he could do nothing for it in a christian way. He must first believe and know that God had cleansed it, that the incoming of Christ into the race had given it a new value, before he could represent or apply Christianity. That is what every principle which we are asked to affirm, every cause we are asked to aid, every work we are asked to do, expects of us,

and waits for at our hands, namely, the sufficient sense of its value. The unvalued, the undervalued work is the work we cannot do, the undervalued cause is the cause we cannot serve, the undervalued man is the man we cannot save.

You have now the reason and the motive of my subject, Professional Values. I am to try to say to you, in as emphatic words as I can use, that the various callings of life will give back to you, and through you will give out to others, in exact proportion to the values which you see in them, or can put into them. The great saying of Jesus forces itself upon you, "With what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again." I want to have you think of the honor implied in such sayings as this, and that of my text. They seem to be uttered in the tone of rebuke or warning, but they carry in them the high distinction of power; they recognize in us the ability to actually deal with men and things about us according to the values we may find in them, and so to get the reward which attends the largest valuation.

What is the ground of professional values? What gives distinctive value to a profession? First, the degree of attainment required for the practice of a profession, determined chiefly by

the character and amount of training for it; second, the place assigned by common consent to a given profession in its ministry to human needs, determined chiefly by its nearness to human life. The first is the intellectual basis of a profession; the second its moral basis. I shall not delay upon the intellectual valuation of the professions. There is no possible agreement here. The public cannot enter judgment, and professional judgments are at variance. The philosopher can be counted upon not to overvalue the industry of the investigator; the investigator can be counted upon not to overvalue the speculations of the philosopher. I should not like to be made a judge or divider in this matter of professional values on the intellectual side. But on the moral side, with which we are now concerned, everybody has the right to an opinion, and it is the common opinion which is decisive. The principle is well established and acknowledged that the professions are to be rated in terms of moral value according to their nearness to human life, especially to the life of the individual. The professions which make the most sensitive and vital contact with us personally are those which we invest with the most seriousness if not sacredness of purpose. We make the greatest demand in personal character upon all who enter these professions. We expect the

most from them in the crises of our personal lives.

According to this classification the first group is made up of the professions of the ministry, of teaching, and of medicine. As much as these differ, one from another, they have this in common that they touch the individual life of the community at the most sensitive points. Those who enter these professions must think, and act, and live close to the lives of others. Hence the very peculiar place which they hold in the public estimation. They have the right to assume the confidence of the public; they must expect that the public will be jealous of their reputation even to the point of criticism. There is no danger here from the undervaluing of one's profession. The whole danger is from professionalism. The constant struggle of the minister, the teacher, and the doctor is the struggle with the conventional and artificial. The great sins which are open to them, and almost alone to them, are the sins of cant, sham, and hypocrisy. The danger of these professions indicates their moral advantage. Those who practice them have the stimulus of dealing with the truths of the spiritual and physical world; they have the added stimulus of the daily contact with the bodies, minds, and souls of men. I have not said that the men of

these professions are more essential to human welfare than those of some other professions or callings. I am saying that they gain the largest reflex influence in the way of moral stimulus from their work and its human environment.

Following the principle of classification before us, we reach a second group made up of the professions of law and journalism, professions which have to do not so much with the individual life as with the collective life of the community, with the order of society, the stability of government, the maintenance of popular rights, the organization and direction of public sentiment. Within these professions we are evidently at one remove from the close personality of the professions already considered. There is not the same steady personal impact upon the individual life. There may be even the somewhat artificial impersonality of the press. Both lawyer and journalist reach us through the medium of principles and facts. The lawyer interprets, adjusts, and applies those principles which insure the public order, and strengthen the security of life and possessions. The journalist presents, interprets, and applies the current fact in its bearing upon the well-being and progress of society. I protest against the theory that the journalist is merely a purveyor of news. I do not accept the idealizing

statement of Lord Rosebery, who would eliminate the editorial page from the newspaper. "I believe," he said recently, "that an ideal paper would be a well-arranged 'Times' without the leading articles. My idea of journalistic happiness would be that we should have advertised and called out and brought to our notice nothing but truth, uncriticised, unmitigated, and undefiled." No, not that alone. When the journalist has the truth of the fact in his possession and has given it to us, his professional work has just begun. He is to interpret and apply the current fact. He is to use it according to his insight for the development of public sentiment. The professional value of journalism lies in opinions as well as in facts. A newspaper must have a policy if it would satisfy the professional demands upon journalism. Newspapers in general do have a policy. The chief difference between them is that some make the news work the policy, if necessary fit the policy, while others, presenting the accessible or ascertainable fact, come out into the open field of argument and discussion to enforce its teachings. The journal of opinions, of fair, consistent, urgent opinions, is still the journal of influence. Notwithstanding Lord Rosebery's sneer at the "leading article," the London journal which has had more influence than any other foreign journal

in forming public sentiment on foreign issues in the United States, is a journal without a scrap of news, "The Spectator." This paper has been quoted far and wide over the land, and through its serious treatment of our new duties to civilization, its ardent appeals to national pride, its generous recognition of our future place in the Anglo-Saxon supremacy, has built up a powerful sentiment around these ideas. The sentiments expressed I believe to be more English than American, more consistent with the genius of the British Empire than of the American Republic, but of their existence and extent there can be no more doubt than of the ability and efficiency of this contributing cause.

When we test the profession of the law by its relation to human interests, we see that its work, though at a remove, is direct and authoritative. The law creates the conditions of all human intercourse. It knows nothing of us as individuals; it can say nothing to us as such. But the moment one man stands in the presence of another, the law enters and dictates what each may or may not do, what each may or may not say. In so far as we belong to the social order we are the subjects of law. The practice of the profession, as it goes on in the routine of the courts, affects us all, though we may never enter a court or concern ourselves

with a single case. We recognize this fact and attach a corresponding moral value to the working of the law. We understand that it is its conservatism which insures the continuity of the social and political order. We understand that its even-handed justice is the truest mercy. We understand that its very restrictions and vexatious delays are not by intention for the hinderance of honest men, but rather for their defense against dishonest men. The moral value of the law is seen in the one plain fact that the most terrible calamity which can befall a people is the perversion of justice. The normal working of law is toward righteousness, and there is no inconsistency between law and liberty. Let me remind you that the burden of the great struggle against slavery, preceding the war, fell upon those trained to the profession of law. Congress was then made up chiefly of members of the legal profession. I believe that the struggle for human rights had a better chance then than it would have now. The men of that time were schooled in principles of justice which had so close an alliance with the principles of freedom and equality that they could not suppress or deny their united pleadings. I have just laid down Mr. McCall's "Thaddeus Stevens." Mr. Stevens was a lawyer by instinct as well as by training, practicing his profession

till fifty-eight years of age, and then surrendering himself with his developed powers to the political battle against slavery. His public service was the living example of an advocate of freedom. He was in many ways a unique man, but he was representative of the spirit of many of his profession in their devotion to liberty. The professional was the personal. "I repose," Mr. Stevens wrote for his epitaph, "in this quiet and secluded spot, not from any natural preference for solitude, but finding other cemeteries limited as to race by charter rules, I have chosen this, that I might illustrate in my death the principles which I advocated through a long life, the equality of man before his Creator."

It would be interesting to trace into the region of art the principle which fixes the moral valuation of a profession. Certainly the great artists, whether in architecture, sculpture, painting, or music, do their work in the closest possible relation to the human. It is not the individual life alone which they touch, nor the collective life, it is the universal life.

But I cannot turn aside into this attractive field. My thought must follow the current of your choices, and these reach beyond the recognized professions into territory which is as yet undefined. The college man of to-day cannot be cov-

ered by the old classifications. As the analyst of the last decade of Yale graduates says, "The typical graduate of to-day is no longer a scholar but a man of affairs, and he tends to the section of the country where the growth of population and the concentration of industries offer him the greatest opportunities for usefulness and success." I am intent upon following this typical graduate, whether of Yale, or Dartmouth, or any other college, that I may ask him, what valuation he will put upon his calling. The question is not prompted by any professional pharisaism. My motive is quite the reverse. I believe that professional values already exist, in many forms of business, which await recognition. Will the college man see these values and appropriate them, or will he allow himself to fall into superficial estimates and accept the final and sufficient reward of his work in money? Will he carry into his choices and methods the true professional spirit, or will he adopt the commercial spirit as his guide and standard? I will tell you what I think the professional spirit ought to do for a man.

It ought to lead him to find his chief satisfaction in his chosen work rather than in any secondary results from it. Here is a very good test. A man does not enter a profession to abandon it as

soon as he can live without it. A profession is in his eyes not a temporary means to a livelihood nor to a fortune. Men do not retire from the practice of a profession as soon as they have a competence. That which drew them holds them. Professional service like any other must be estimated, for certain practical uses, in money. But the current term in which you may estimate all successful service most fairly is not money, but reputation. Three of you of equal ability go your ways, one into teaching, one into law, one into business. You reach the highest positions open to you in your separate careers. Forty years hence you come back to the college. The undergraduates of that day will rise up to do you impartial honor. A great scholar, a great advocate or jurist, a great manager of men, in what term can you estimate them, except in a term which fits the common greatness. Reputation stands, with hardly an exception, for character and success, and is the result, with hardly an exception, of that satisfaction in one's work which enables him to get the most out of it, and the most out of himself. It is the professional spirit which schools a man to find his chief satisfaction in his work.

This same spirit teaches one also to emphasize the virtues of his calling. Professional honor is

a significant phrase. It means that at certain points at least there must be a scrupulous integrity, a generous sacrifice of self-interest, a sensitive regard for the rights of others or for the common good. Some of the older forms of business have an equivalent kind of honor. Wherever you find that, support it with all your heart; wherever it is wanting, labor above all things to create it. The business you undertake will be worthless to you without it.

The professional spirit asserts itself most clearly in the insistence which it places upon the moral element in work. The great callings are intensely human, they look straight toward humanity. I have often reminded you of the fact that they have their rise in, and flow out of truth, justice, mercy, the very attributes of God. So far therefore as one comes under the power of the professional spirit he cannot evade the constant question, What does my work mean to men? Is it gaining human results? The question, as you see, is far reaching, and it enters into the details of one's calling. It is the supreme question to-day in the world of affairs. Every business represents an aggregation of human lives. The moral part of all business involves the proper consideration of the lives it controls, not in ways of charity, much less in ways of patronage, but through

intelligent and sympathetic helpfulness. At the close of the exercises attending the opening of the new library and clubhouse at Wilder, a statement was read by the remaining partner of the original firm of Wilder Brothers, to the effect that negotiations for the transfer of the works to the International Paper Company had been delayed for a year until sufficient assurances could be given that in the transfer the workmen would suffer no loss. That statement, read at the opening of this workmen's clubhouse, illustrates to my mind the meaning of business philanthropy.

You naturally ask me if the world of affairs will allow this invasion of the professional spirit, if it be such as I have described it. Why not? Who control that world except those who live in it? If any of you are to take up your residence there, you will have all the rights of citizenship in it, the right to vote, to speak, to act. The world of affairs is not a hostile world. It is to-day inviting the incoming of college men. True, it is the intellectual training which they are supposed to bring which is most wanted, but I am persuaded that the moral purpose is not unwelcome. Entering there without arrogance or assumption, college men will not be asked to be disloyal to their ideals. They may or may not be able to open new professions. That no one can

foretell. The profession of civil engineering has always maintained an honorable and undisputed place there, and it is making it possible for men of like training and attainments and purposes to occupy adjacent territory. The departments of production and distribution, to which I have referred, are certainly beginning to require a preparation as exacting as professional study, and to offer fields for essentially professional practice. No one would say that economic questions are less intricate than legal or political questions. We have discussed for a good many years the place of the educated man in politics. Where are the centres of political activity to-day? I should say unhesitatingly, in our cities, and in connection with their affairs. But municipal politics are business politics, cities are corporations. The science of government is fast becoming the science of administration. The science of administration is a fit subject for professional study, and when that fact is fully recognized, the field of administration will be the field for professional practice. We shall some time have a public service at home and abroad which will reach the stability and the dignity of a profession.

What can our colleges give to this world of affairs? Not ready-made talent. Every man must

serve his apprenticeship. His intellectual training must be adjusted to affairs. But intellectual force is not the sole contribution. It was not and is not the sum and substance of the contribution to the professions. What is given to these is intellectual power informed to a greater or less degree by moral purpose.

A member of the House of Lords in presenting Mr. Cecil Rhodes to the stockholders of the South African Company spoke of him as "a man of splendid ideas and of undefeated action." That was a fine thing to say of any man. But I should like to mend the saying a bit. I would rather be able to say of a leader, he is a man of splendid ideals and of undaunted action. The idea is included in the ideal, but it does not fill it. The intellectual must exist in commanding force, but it must have moral stimulus and support. The idea can charm, fascinate, awaken, and stir us. The ideal can do all that. It can also command, challenge, and rebuke us. It can call the whole man into its service and hold his face to the light. I should rather say undaunted in place of undefeated action. There are things which are more to be desired than immediate success. The man who worships success will sometimes fall in pieces before his idol. The possibility of early

defeat, in place of unworthy success, must be provided for in education. We want to send the undaunted man, with his ideals, into the world of affairs. For any such man I have no fear of the final success, nor of the final welcome.

## VI

## THE DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONAL POWER

"Freely ye have received, freely give." — MATTHEW x, 8.

THE shortening of the receptive period is a marked characteristic of modern education. The tendency is toward those methods through which the exceptional student passes into the specialist. I am not now concerned to inquire into the educational value of the change, to ask, for example, to what extent it has actually advanced the stage of intellectual and moral maturity. The effect of which I wish to take note is seen in the increased eagerness, often impatience, of college men to be at work, in their readiness to assume responsibility, and in the growing consciousness of personal power. This fact explains in part, I think, the quickening pace of modern life. One generation presses hard upon another. A man is no sooner about his own work than he hears behind him the eager cry of the oncoming generation.

Speaking now to this present fact without passing judgment upon it, I proceed to discuss with you one of the more advanced questions within the field of giving, — namely, the question of the Distribution of Personal Power. When men be-

gin to think more about doing and giving than about receiving, it is time to talk with them about doing and giving.

Where shall a man give of himself? There may be demands which he may not acknowledge as imperative. There may be obligations which he ought not to ignore or diminish. Let me try to help you toward a clear and honorable discrimination in the use of personal power. I will say, however, at the beginning, to avoid any possible misapprehension of my meaning, that the essential word in my text is the word "freely." "Freely ye have received, freely give." The discrimination which I am to urge upon you does not mean how much or how little of a man. The law of effective giving allows no such division. A man must learn how to give the whole of himself. I count this the secret of all success, as it is certainly the secret of all influence. We put the calculating man only a grade above the insincere man. If we have the right to a man at all we feel that we have the right to him at his best. You can test this feeling in so simple a matter as that of attention. You resent the indifferent, listless, unsympathetic attitude of a person more than you resent refusal. We do not get very far into life until we learn how costly a thing it is to live. The progress of the world is carefully registered, could we but see it, in the expenditure

of personal power. "Freely ye have received" — that means that somebody gave freely, gave of himself to you. "Freely give" — that means, maintain the great succession. Pass on good gifts to men. Pour out of yourselves into the heart of the world.

Assuming that there is but one answer to the question, if anybody is disposed to ask it, how much or how little shall I give of myself — give all — there is abundant room, as any one can see, for the question about the distribution of personal power.

My first answer to this question is, that it is not only a personal duty, but equally a social and public duty, for a man to attend to his own business. Every honorable business honorably conducted is a contribution to society. Other men are the richer for the honest, enterprising trader in the community. Other men's homes are the safer for the presence of the skillful doctor. I do not know why we should limit the public service to office holding, or think of an office as a trust beyond any legitimate and necessary business. The distinction is harmful. It is not true. Lawyer, editor, doctor, teacher, minister, merchant, producer, all these men touch me and my neighbors, sensitively and permanently. I am concerned in the quality of their work, its intellectual and its moral

quality. Sharp practice at the bar, the ignorant practice of medicine, insincere or uninspiring preaching, sensational journalism, unbusinesslike business of any kind, these things cheapen the life of a community. They make it poor and mean. They affect values as directly as taxation or the tariff. I would as soon live under a bad government as in a community where the professions and business had gone over into the hands of weak or scheming men. All of which goes to show how much of a man's time, invention, enthusiasm, and conscience his own work may absorb in the interest of others. All private business rightly conducted is public service. Let no man be diverted from the necessary attention to his own business by any demands from without. In the language of political authority, that is paramount.

My further answer is that in the distribution of personal power allowance must be made for some kind of personal identification with those things which are of recognized value in society. I use the term identification because it is at once broad and decisive. It does not prescribe definite method or form; it does assume a very definite attitude of support. Any one who has occasion to analyze society is constantly reminded of the unfairness in the distribution of social burdens. Social burdens are carried upon the shoulders of the willing,

not altogether upon the shoulders of the able. A very considerable minority withdraws itself, either through thoughtlessness or selfishness. The criticism is often passed upon college graduates that they are slow in taking up the social duties of the community in which they may place themselves. There are various reasons which may be given for this hesitancy, reasons which in some cases may be sufficient, but the criticism is worthy of attention.

A young man is apt to make two mistakes in his estimate of organized society. His first mistake is in underestimating the value of the conventional, the institutional. Institutions acquire faults like men, but they are the faults of greatness not of littleness. Before anything can become an institution it must have attained to great dimensions, reaching, as Milton says of the state, up to "the stature of an honest man." Institutions may fail in some present emergency, but they stand for the best which men have thought, or done, or suffered. They are rich in the wealth of humanity. They are as generous as they are wealthy. A university has recently been defined as the "means by which the highest culture of one generation is best transmitted to the ablest youths of the next." More than this might be said of the church, because it is deeper in its sources

and wider in its reach. The man who fails to honor, to reverence institutions, fails because he lacks the historic sense, imagination, and insight.

A second mistake is in underestimating the need of support on the part of institutions. As they were built up by effort and struggle and sacrifice they must be maintained through the use of the human, the personal. And those who are maintaining them need constant reinforcement. I wish that I could make plain to you the welcome which awaits every well-qualified young man who proposes to identify himself with the institutions of any community, be it in city or country. It is not simply one more worker. It is the incoming of a fresh invigorating presence. As in a political body, hedged in, it may be, by traditions, let a strong, courageous, earnest man speak out, and men may listen all the more eagerly if they have to ask his name. I am not contradicting what I said a little while ago about attending to one's business. Our social obligations, certainly at first, do not make great demands upon us. They do not ask for large time or great gifts of any sort. They ask for what I have called identification,— the support that is of interest, sympathy, and influence. And it is not wise to ignore their request. A young man cannot afford to leave a community long in doubt as to his position on

plain vital matters. A too politic introduction of himself will certainly react upon him. He will not easily remove that first impression of moral indifference or of calculation. One cannot begin too early to establish his reputation, to tell his fellow men where he stands, to give them the data on which they may fix his social value.

I advance one step further in my answer and into a somewhat different region. In the distribution of personal power I lay very great stress upon the value of personal opinion, opinion which has the worth of the man in it. Public opinion is in theory and in fact the ruling force in a democracy. Who make public opinion? Usually those who have the most to contribute to it. It is at no time a matter of mere numbers. Even when the mob is in power the average man on the outside counts for more than the average man on the inside, except as the latter is more capable of being welded into the mass through some strong leader. A great leader must rely more upon knowledge than upon ignorance. That is the long fact. The essential thing is to see that it is not the merely cunning and crafty ones who rule. This can be prevented by making public opinion more worthy of itself, by allowing nothing which belongs to it to be withdrawn or withheld.

The three sufficient factors in public opinion

are intelligence, sympathy, and courage. The proportion in which these are needed depends of course upon the subject on which opinion is to be exercised, but it is seldom if ever that any one can be left out,—intelligence to discern and measure the question at issue, sympathy to interpret and represent the interests of those concerned in it, and courage to uphold the idea or principle which may be involved. Let us never commit the error of supposing that courage is nourished and grows strong on anything lower than an idea or principle. Men do not fight for things until they idealize them. They relate them to rights, justice, and freedom; then they do battle for them. Hampden did not fight against the royal tax, he fought for liberty. I do not know at what point educated men are most likely to fail in their contribution to public opinion, but I have no doubt that some of them fail at the point of intelligence. A great scholar may be grossly ignorant of current affairs, or his opinion may be so immature as to be utterly impracticable. I commend to you a good newspaper as one of your future text-books. You can do nothing, say nothing, think nothing of any public value without current facts. With these in possession and well considered you have the right to express yourself in criticism, or if need be in protest. I do not speak of the expression of ap-

proval of public measures, for it has come to be understood that silence is acquiescence. It is only the unexpected, or exceptional, which is not satisfied with approval, which calls for applause.

As a compensation for the scholar who withdraws from the facts of common concern that he may pursue his unvexed study, we have in increasing numbers the expert whose work lies adjacent to the public needs. It is not generally understood how many college instructors are employed in the editorial work of the daily papers, or how frequent is the call for college men to leave their chairs of instruction and engage in journalism. The demand for writers of this class has become so great as to be appreciable in its effect upon the teaching force in colleges and universities. A further demand, which has been honorably met, has called to the aid of the government trained men whose knowledge of foreign peoples, or of foreign affairs, has been timely and helpful. The number of commissions recently appointed shows the amount and range of talent outside its own force, within easy call of the government. Opportunities are not wanting for capable men to determine public policies. Nothing can be more legitimate or honorable than the acceptance of these opportunities. But for the most part the man who remains at his own post, and attends to his own

business, must exert his influence within the realm of opinion. There the opportunity is sufficient, and the duty is imperative. I cannot overestimate the influence in any community of the man of sane judgment, of broad sympathies, and of consistent action. It is much to know what men think whose words do not run in the current gossip. "The heart of the wise teacheth his mouth, and addeth learning to his lips." But there are times when opinions and words are insufficient, when the man who would meet his full obligation must act. The man whose opinions are deep enough to be convictions may, and probably will, have occasion to test them. There are disagreeable duties to be met in every community, if one is really in earnest about the public good. It does not make them pleasant to say that they are in the interest of reform. The way of the reformer is about as hard as the way of the transgressor. But it is not to be shunned if it opens naturally out of one's daily path. It has been said that one condition of assuming responsibility is the capacity to bear suffering and to inflict suffering. Opinions which mean anything may become costly. They may reach into those values which are usually expressed in terms of conscience.

I am not inclined to go further in indicating the immediate and direct distribution of personal

power. Whoever attends to his own business in such way that he renders thereby a public service; whoever identifies himself positively and helpfully with the institutions of society; whoever makes his opinion a worthy factor in public opinion, supporting it, if need be, by vigorous and timely action, satisfies in the main the claims which ought to be made upon him personally. And in doing these things he has the right to the approval of his own conscience. But there is still a point beyond all this, of which I take note, at which personal power gives way to delegated power. It may not be possible to draw the clear line between personal and delegated power; but we certainly do reach a limit beyond which we can do better to trust others, to act through others, to turn over authority to others, than to attempt further extension of our own powers. The principle of delegated power is reaching back more and more into the field of personal responsibility and action. The process of division and subdivision is going on in the field of personal responsibility corresponding to the same process in the general field of work. The motive of this reduction is not the relief of the individual, but the greater public good. The public good requires definite and permanent service within manageable areas.

The territory within which we have been most reluctant to recognize the working of this principle has been that of politics. We were for long time content to allow a good many things to be done poorly for the sake of giving the greatest numbers the chance of doing them. We reasoned that it was undemocratic to restrict political occupations, certainly to apply to them the rules of ordinary business. But gradually we yielded to the law of delegated power. Democracy could not withstand principles older than itself and more universal. We have come to see that we must require qualifications for the service of the state, if the state is to maintain its authority and extend its influence. We have not come to see, or to understand in full measure, that the principle of delegated power must be accepted even if it does not satisfy the ideals or possible results of personal power. There was a time when the citizens of Boston organized themselves into a watch-and-ward society to protect the town. They patrolled the streets at night. They made arrests and executed the laws according to their judgment. Doubtless the personal standard of that early watch-and-ward society was somewhat above that of the present police of the city, possibly the laws were better administered at its hands, but nobody supposes that any like arrangement could now

protect the city. We outgrow more quickly than we think the limits of personal or associated action, in distinction from organized and delegated action.

I suppose that we still overestimate the effect of the personal element in the reconstruction and purification of politics. The casual entrance of an outside man into party politics has little or no meaning beyond that of indorsement. He must be in and of the party, a permanent and persistent force, to effect any change. We have tried to introduce the element of political independence into our political system. We have met with varying results. The chief difficulty in the way of making independent action effective has been the inequality between the great political parties since the Civil War. A strong, alert, and consistent opposition is the condition of safe government by party. It was a national misfortune that the Democratic party lost its power of effective opposition through its attitude on slavery, and again through its attitude on the currency. The independent in politics is a force so long as he holds the balance of power. When he takes the open field, he must organize or fail; and organization means, as I have said, much more than association, it means in the end delegated power. We are practically committed, except in local affairs,

to party government. It is the English as distinguished from the Continental method. The alternative is government by groups and cliques. Must we then submit to the slavery of party? Why should we? We do not allow delegated power elsewhere to become a tyranny. Why should we here? Because it is necessary, and on the whole the strongest and best thing, to act through great parties, to which representative principles and policies may be committed, are we bound to tolerate and indorse corruption? The answer thus far has been tolerance up to a very high limit, then revolt or rebellion; in municipal politics the occasional overturning usually of temporary significance; in national politics the occasional transfer of power from one party to another in the way of rebuke. Have we no better outlook than the repetition of these results? Have we gone to the root of the matter in placing our reliance upon reform and in training reformers? Why not recognize politics as a business, as a profession? Why not train men to do the business right in the first instance? Why not start in with the idea of making a good politician instead of a reformer? Why allow so noble a science as politics to be broken up and to fall in pieces between the "statesman" and the "politician"? If the real power, delegated power, lies

in party, then put your man, your whole man, in the seat of power. If that is the seat of authority, make it a place, if not the place, of honor.

But you say to me, do you mean just this? Would you advise us to go into practical politics as you would advise us to go into business or the professions? That is just what I want to say. I can see no more honorable or inviting opportunity for a firm and patient ambition than municipal, or, under certain conditions, national politics. The apprenticeship is long. Temptations are not lacking. But the way is open. Difficulties are not insurmountable. If a good man gives the same attention to business that a bad man gives he is more likely to succeed. The only drawback to a noble success in American politics is the unwillingness of the people to acknowledge, and rightly estimate the fact, that politics represents delegated power, that it is too large a thing to be possessed through the inroads of personal enthusiasm. Politics is a territory to be occupied, where men may make their habitation, and live honestly, and be held in honor by their fellow men. The scholar may go into politics, if he will, but let him go there to gain a residence. Let him go to learn as well as to teach. Let him keep his faith in men, but let him be patient with them. Let him accept honor and rejoice in it, but let

him rejoice most in the service he can render. Let him stand to his task, as men stand to whom are intrusted the honor and safety of the nation, that other men may do their work securely and in peace.

"Freely ye have received, freely give." You have yet to learn the art of giving. Be patient with yourselves, more patient than you are in learning the art of receiving. The art of giving is learned by much practice, and through some mistakes. The only fatal mistake lies in not giving enough. I have tried to show you how you may give wisely of yourselves, where you may distribute your personal power. But who can forecast your work? Who knows where your lot may fall? Who may presume to anticipate the glorious details of any man's life, who believes that every man's life is a plan of God?

# VII

## A MAN'S SOUL AND HIS WORLD

"What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" — MATTHEW xvi, 26.

IT is among the traditions of the class-room of Mark Hopkins, I have been told, that he once put the question of our Lord to his class in this way: "You would like to have the world, as much of it at least as you want. Would you be willing to have the world, all of it that you want, and be deaf? Perhaps you would.

"Would you be willing to have the world, all of it that you want, and be deaf and dumb? Perhaps you would.

"Would you be willing to have the world, all of it that you want, and be deaf and dumb and blind? Perhaps you would, but I doubt it: for the time comes in such a reckoning when you must face the issue of being or having."

This question of Jesus, if put before men as an alternative, can have but one answer. There is such a radical difference between being and having that few men will deliberately sacrifice anything which they feel to be a vital part of themselves for things that lie outside themselves.

It requires very little reasoning to understand that the loss of a sense means a corresponding loss of the world, that it takes so much out of the value of things for which the exchange is made. And as men go deeper in their reasoning they can see that the principle acts with increasing force the farther it reaches below the range of the senses. No one of you believes, on second thought, that you could use or enjoy the world without a conscience any better than you could without sight. You can see that the world is not the same object of pleasurable desire with those in whom the moral sense has been reduced or enfeebled, just as you can see the loss to those who suffer from physical disabilities.

We may assume, I think, that there is substantial agreement, so far as the principle goes, that a man cannot afford the world at the cost of his soul. But in any endeavor to apply the principle we find ourselves confronted at once with the very practical difficulty that as every one of us has his soul, so every one of us has his world. Naturally and rightly we wish to make the best of each. Interpreting the common desire by our own desires, we are not to think that the average man wishes to throw away his soul any more than he wishes to give over one of his senses. That is not the way in which men lose their souls.

Neither are we to think that the average man ought to throw away the world in so far as it is his world. To entertain this opinion seriously would carry us back into the narrowest type of mediævalism.

What, then, shall we say is the true and proper relation of a man's soul to *his* world?

If we had been present when our Lord put the question now before us, we should doubtless have wished to say to Him, — "Master, must a man lose his soul in trying to gain his world? You say, 'if a man gain the whole world and lose his own soul.' Is that the alternative? Must a man lose either his soul or his world?"

It seems, I say, as if we should have wished to put this direct question to our Lord, had we heard the words which fell from his lips. But why should any one to-day doubt the answer in the light of his after teachings, or in the light of his whole personal life? Christianity, as it comes to us from Him, does not mean other worldliness. It does not mean mediævalism, the monk's world. Nothing is further from the spirit or the word of Christ than any mockery of man in his relation to his world. The world element in our lives may waken the pity of Christ, it is so transient; it may call out his warnings, it has in it such possibilities of evil; but nowhere does

He speak of it in contempt, or in scorn, or in hate. A man's world may represent that which he has rescued from the fleeting years, that which he has conquered from the grasp of evil; or, it may represent the honorable accumulations and earnings of his life, the very increment of his soul, his knowledge, his work, his friends, his plans and struggles and hopes, against which his soul can have no contention, and from which it can suffer no loss.

And there is a sense, truer even than that in which we have the world by gain or conquest, in which we have it by original endowment, just as we have our souls at the hand of God. The prodigal was right when he said, "Father, give me the portion of goods which falleth to me." His sin consisted in that he gathered all together and took his journey into a far country and wasted his substance in riotous living. Had he remained at home he would have heard for himself the word which came to his brother, — "Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine." We make the fatal concession when we yield our rights of ownership in this world. There was the very point of Christ's temptation and of his victory. When the tempter came to Him, and showed to Him the kingdoms of the world, and said to Him, "All these things will I give thee, if

thou wilt fall down and worship me," he overreached and betrayed himself. The answer of Christ was instant.

"Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." This world is God's world. It goes with the worship of Him. It belongs to his worshipers. So Christ met his temptation. He saw at once the unreality and sham of it. The tempter stood before Him with the offer of something which was not his to give. It was a piece of bold, naked assumption. Christ saw the deception, and met the deceiver with the word of rightful authority. The usurper of this world found himself in the presence of the true heir and master of the world, and in this capacity the representative of humanity. That was the issue of the final temptation of our Lord.

But as for us, we are still deceived and betrayed. We acknowledge at once the evil ownership. We allow the assumption that the world has gone out of the hands of God, and therefore out of our hands as God's children, and having made this fatal allowance we naturally begin to ask at what price we can get back the part of it which we want. And so concession follows concession. The premise once granted, there is no rescue from the inexorable logic. Nothing then remains to a man who wants the world except the surrender of

so much of his manhood as seems necessary to the attainment of his object. Here we have the explanation of the choices of many men. One profession, or business, or calling, is chosen rather than another, because it is assumed that the less christian a man's profession or business or calling is, the more of the world there is in it. And this choice made, then the method of the profession or business or calling follows the same assumption. It is the next logical step to assume that the less christian the method is the more of the world will be the result. So the principle of exchange becomes a recognized principle. Christ saw it at work in his day. Anybody can see it at work still. There are few men, I believe, who go into their various pursuits without the latent feeling that concession or compromise may at some time become necessary to success. Some resolve that when the issue comes they will sacrifice success. Others go through life without raising any clear or sharp moral issue. If they lose morally, the losses are gradual and unnoted. All that can be said of such men is that their character lacks fibre or tone. Here and there a man sees the issue, accepts the assumed condition, and deliberately surrenders his manhood. He takes his soul into the market place, puts his price upon it, and sells it. Hence the constant succession of

tragedies in the life of a great city. Transactions of this sort do not appear in the quotations of the markets, but exchanges are none the less made and put on record.

Now a right theory of life will not insure right conduct. Wrong theories of life are much more sure to produce wrong conduct. My contention therefore is against the theory that a man cannot save his soul and his world. The issue is a false one. I protest against it in the name of religion. Consider what it means. It means that human life is nothing but a dilemma. Turn which way a man will, he faces loss. The game is against him. Do you believe this to be the moral situation? Does this accord with your conception of God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth? Does it seem to you to fit any rational idea of a moral government? Is it a fact? Does God send his children here to face the alternative of a lost soul or a lost world? Does He cast them into this dilemma and then withdraw to watch the fatal struggle? Is this a possible conception of God, of religion, of the moral significance of human life? The statement of the theory refutes it.

I am not content, however, with any refutation of the theory. We need a theory of human life which is positive, consistent, and satisfying. Con-

sistent, I say, as well as satisfying. We know that we do not want to be unsuccessful good men. The unsuccessful good man is not the normal type. The normal type is the successful good man. Modern Christianity is trying to produce this type. In other words it is trying to save the world, not simply to save the souls of men out of the world. Mediæval Christianity said that this was an impossible task, and gave it up. It took men out of the world, and shut them up in monasteries in protest against the grossness and violence of the times. Modern Christianity says that the task is not impossible, that it ought to be done, that it can be done, that it is being done. In proof of its faith it points to the process now going on, the organization of the world in the interest of righteousness. That is the meaning of good government, of good law, of good literature, of good business. There are failures enough to discourage some men, and to make others cynical and scornful. It is no easy task. But it is no harder than trying to save souls without saving the world. It is the peculiar task of the strong man of to-day, strong in intelligence as well as in purpose. The training of such a man, if it is worth anything, ought to give him the advantage of estimating values at their actual worth. He ought to be able to defend himself against the cheap, smart,

superficial side of the world. He ought to know the difference between a professional success that has a value which cannot be fully expressed in money, and a professional success that has no other value than money, or its equivalent in something as transient. Every calling has two sides, — law, journalism, medicine, the ministry. Each and every one of them, and every kind of business, has a part which can be organized into the righteousness of the world. Each and every one of them, and every kind of business, has a part which can be used to the loss of soul, with no real gain of the world. Suppose a preacher is vain, insincere, self-seeking, greedy of place or of applause, and uses his ministry to these lower ends. Can he not hear the diviner voice, the voice of the world, even, which is saying to him in moments of reality, "Come up higher; leave the low plane of your foolish ambitions and take to the heights of your calling"? Suppose the calling is law, or journalism, or the public service, and one puts it to second uses and gets the rewards of second uses, does not his trained nature revolt at the use and at the reward? If it does not, then his training has only made him a mere expert worldling. It simply enables him to grovel a little more successfully than the untrained man at his side. Or suppose one deals at first hand in

money. Money is his business. Does he not know that money has two sides, one clean, spotless, bright; the other dirty, foul, and black? Is it any satisfaction to him that one dollar will buy as much of some things as the other, when he knows that it will not buy honor, respect, or gratitude from one human heart?

Yes, modern Christianity is making some things plain. It is showing that there are two ways of doing the same outward thing, and in so far as it can make the difference clear, it is redeeming the world by challenging all newcomers to take the better way. I cannot be mistaken in assuming that each new generation does something to make the world more worthy of the ambitions of men. If not, if we are bringing up men without moral vision, who have no power to strive by the better method, who must succumb after a little, and swell the volume of the thoughtless, indifferent, self-seeking throng, then we need to revise our training quite as much on the intellectual as on the moral side. The Scriptures use good, honest, searching language about men who do not know enough not to be deceived and snared and caught in the mere temptations of worldliness. They tell a man in one way or another that he is a fool; or, as in the calmer speech of our Lord, they put him to a reckoning of the profit that may be ex-

pected to come from that world which has been bought at the loss of soul. To every man who is taking hold upon life in the spirit of mere calculation, who is trifling with this principle of exchange, the words of our Lord come with as vivid and startling force as when they were uttered. What is your profit? What have you when you have your world, and miss your soul?

Let us go back for a moment into the calculation. You are thinking perhaps of the analogy with which I began my sermon, between the loss of physical power and the loss of moral power. And you may be ready to say — But we do take physical risks; we do make physical losses to secure outward ends. Why should we not take moral risks on occasion, if need be, allow some moral concessions and sacrifices? I answer the question by asking you to compare the relative effect of each loss in a man's own thought and consciousness. One may give up physical strength, he may surrender years of his life, and glory in the sacrifice. So men go out from us year by year to battle with the darkness and cold of the North, leaving behind them, if they return, they know not how many years of their lives. So men went out from us a generation ago, to return from distant battlefields maimed and wounded, living still among us in unaffected pride and honor,

as they recall the sacrifice. Do you know the man, or if you know him would you take his place, who is wont to point with like pride to the moral losses which stand for his world? Do you know a man of fortune, if that fortune has been gained by fraud, who delights to call up the men whom he has cheated, and exhibit them as his victims? Do you know a man who has risen to any heights of statesmanship, if his early career had been marked by corruption, who delights to uncover his early practices and glory in them? Do you know a man, save the veriest profligate, who delights to hold up the hearts which he has betrayed and shamed? Such men do exist. Would you take the place of any one of them?

And yet we are in constant danger of forgetting that it is the soul in us which makes the world desirable. When that is reduced, the world is reduced; when that is gone, the world is gone. The parable of our Lord spoken to this point has its constant illustration before our eyes. Some one who has been putting this principle of exchange into practice reaches the time when he can pull down his barns and build greater, and then begin to say to his soul: "Soul, take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry." But the soul answers him not a word. It is dumb and dead. And the man goes about among his possessions, solitary and

empty. The world looks on in pity or contempt, and says that he has overdone the matter. At what point in the process of this exchange of his soul for the world did he begin to overdo the matter?

And not only are we in danger of forgetting that it is the soul in us which makes the world desirable, we are more apt to forget that it is the soul in the world which makes it desirable. Take that out, and the world loses its value in our eyes for the lowest purposes. To use the extremest form of statement, it is the virtue there is in the world which makes vice attractive. Take the virtue out of a city, let vice walk the streets shamelessly and unrebuked, and every profligate, at least of wealth, would leave the city for another in which there was virtue enough to make vice a temptation. Take law out of a city, and every cheat and defrauder would leave that city for another where there was law enough to make it an object to practice his fraud. No, the world which men sometimes think they want, a world without a conscience, is an impossible world. It does not exist. If it did exist, they would not want it. The plain truth is, that turn the question of our Lord as we will, reduce it to whatever conditions we can imagine, apply it to any possible situation in our lives, it has

but one answer. The world, without the soul there is in it, or the world gained through the loss of soul, is not valuable, it is not desirable. And the advantage of an education, if it have any moral advantage, consists in this, that it enables its possessor to find out and anticipate by his intelligence what others may be obliged to learn by experience.

But the question resting upon this alternative is not now before us. If it is, it is because we raise the issue. The alternative, the dilemma, if it exists, is our own, not of God. The "if" with which Christ opens his question is not of his invention, but forced upon his attention by the practices of men. The true question, perplexing it may be in some of its details, but noble and inspiring in its broad utterance, is that which we have been considering — What is the true and proper relation of a man's soul to *his* world? It grows nobler and more inspiring, as it falls upon the ears of each succeeding generation. For it is becoming more manifestly clear that it is the business of every man according to his conscience to save his soul, and according to his intelligence to save his world. There is no contradiction, provided every man learns how to save his world with and for his soul. The soul is here for a purpose, — here rather than somewhere

else,—and that purpose is not simply to save itself from the world, but to save itself and its world. Even the question of personal salvation is not what we are saved from, but also what we take up with us in the process of our salvation. You send your ship to sail the sea. It comes back to you almost a wreck, the cargo lost, and with only enough of the crew left to bring the dismantled hulk into port. That may be a grand sight. It may tell its own story of suffering and peril and heroism. A whole city may turn out before it in welcome. But that was not the object for which you sent your ship to sail the sea. You waited its return, freighted with the riches for which you built the ship and picked your crew to man it. God sends a soul into this world, and it comes back to Him almost a loss, alone, and empty-handed. That may be a grand sight. It may tell its own story of temptation and struggle and victory, a scarred soul, but saved. All heaven may turn out to give it welcome. But that was not the end for which God sent that soul into the world. He waited its return, rich with the earnings of the years of time. Heaven, it is a common saying, is reserved for those who fail here. Men may so fail here that there are no places in heaven too high for them. But men may so succeed here as to enrich heaven. I

read in the vision of the Holy City : "They shall bring the glory and the honor of the nations into it." That is the honorable, the legitimate, the actual contribution of this world to heaven.

Who can compute the earnings of great souls? Who can estimate their holdings in this wealth of the nations? There is no way except to trace effects which we most value back to their causes, back to the men who produced them. These are the men who in their time left their stamp upon their fellow men and upon events, who widened the paths of justice and of mercy, who led the way to the heights of statesmanship, who carried the light of learning and of religion into dark lands, who consecrated wealth by their methods of bestowing it; men who knew their honest rights in the world, and dared to maintain them; who forced their way across disputed territory, and held the ground for us to occupy till we too were ready to advance. A college ought to stand for this forward movement in the world. There is a world not only of living men, but of living forces. The world means organized power. Men call it the power of church, or state, the power of party, the power of the press, the power of capital, the power of education; they give it a hundred names, and they are all real.

They stand for facts. And these forces represent our world. We cannot ignore them. If we want to save men, to help them in body and soul, if we want to take part in the social endeavor and ministry of our time, the hope of doing any really great good lies in the forces which we possess. The man who is afraid of this intervening world, or misunderstands it, or underestimates its moral value, will certainly lose it. And he who loses his world, will lose the thing of greatest value to him and to other men, next to his soul.

# VIII

## THE CAPACITY FOR THE TRUE

"Which thing is true in him and in you." — 1 JOHN ii, 8.

JUST what thing the Apostle had in mind when he wrote this is not very plain; and we are not curious to stop to ask, for we are at once caught by the saying that anything, no matter now what it may be, which is true in God may be true also in us. Here is a passage which, by the turn of a sentence, flashes its light into our common nature, showing us at a glance the reality of the resemblance between God and men. Their natures correspond, and so close is the correspondence, that the very things which have their seat and home in the life of God may have their seat and home in the life of men.

> "So nigh is grandeur to our dust,
> So near is God to man,
> When Duty whispers low 'Thou must,'
> The Youth replies, 'I can.'"

I want to take this truth, of which we have the passing hint in the words of the Apostle, and try to uncover it before you in something of its breadth and depth. It is the truth that a man is not a fragment, not something separate and iso-

lated unless it be by the compulsion of his own wrongdoing, but rather a part of the whole, with rights in every related part, capable of fellowship with the best as of sympathy with the lowest, able to find access alike to nature and to humanity. And the ground of this capacity is the one fact that the medium of exchange which is current throughout the universe is the true, or as we say more formally, the truth. He can use this medium. The things which are true in God, are true in him, and if in him, then everywhere. Therefore he can reach God, and God can reach him. Therefore he can understand nature, because nature is made to be understood that way. Therefore he can communicate with his own kind, and according to the amount of truth there is in him secure lasting results.

I wish that I could make the positive statement of this thought as strong as the negative statement of it. The negative statement is — the isolation of the untrue. The untrue man is out of reach of God, except for forgiveness or punishment. The untrue man, even though his untruth be a matter of neglect or inaccuracy, gets no sure or far access into nature. The untrue man gradually severs his connection with his own kind. Nobody believes him. His words are idle words. They are without profit. He does not influence,

organize, or command. Every effort which he makes through the use of the untrue, in method or in aim, rebounds, and throws him back from men. At last he loses the one vantage ground of all effort, and gives up the struggle, — a self-defeated, separated, isolated man. Keep then, I ask you, as the background of what I may say, the negative form of my subject, — the isolation of the untrue, the untrue man. And then come out into the positive and quickening statement of it, namely, that it is through our capacity for the true that we have contact, influence, power as touching men, oneness with all related life, access to nature, communion with God.

How can we develop the capacity for the true? how can we use it for the common good? Or keeping the negative form still in mind, how can we make sure that we escape the isolation of the untrue?

The question answers itself. It runs to its conclusion with the simplicity and the certainty of a formula.

First, be true.

Second, get possessions in things which are true.

Third, make the things which are true in you and to you true to other men.

Let us not pass by the beginning of our answer because it is so obvious. This capacity for the

true on the personal side, you say to me, is simply the capacity for character. Yes. But how much do you allow this to mean? The capacity for character is something more than the necessity for character. When Aristotle gave his pupils the secret of oratory — "Your power over your hearers will depend upon what your hearers think of you," — he was emphasizing the necessity for character. Character in his view was essential to the success, at least to the full and lasting success of any man who would try to reach his fellows through speech. "Honesty is the best policy," — there you come into the distinctly commercial aspect of character. I am not speaking of character on this plane. I am speaking of the capacity, not the necessity for character. And I am reminding you that the capacity for the true is the capacity for character. Turn the saying about and let it face the other way. Think of the capacity for character as being the capacity for the true. Who does not want that capacity increased to its natural limit? Suppose one could have, for the asking, a reason which would always work true, and never slip into sophistry or deceit, or an imagination which would always work true, and never trifle or play one false, or a will which would always enforce promptly and courageously all better desires, or a conscience which would

utter its unfailing yea, yea, or nay, nay, would not one think it worth his while to take the gift? But if all these things are to be had for the earning are they any the less desirable? What is education but the earning process, the development of the capacity for the true into the power to be true? What is the meaning of an arrested education, if the arrest be voluntary, except satisfaction with partial and uncertain results, the willingness to take one's chance as to the powers within him, whether they will work true or not? The scholar is not the man who has the mere hunger and thirst for knowledge; that may become an abnormal appetite. The scholar is the man who has begun to feel the passion for the true, first the true in the action of his own powers, then the true in the things he seeks. At first sensitive to errors in the working of his mind, he becomes sensitive to errors in the working of any part of his nature. Otherwise we have a glaring inconsistency. We have the immoral scholar. We have the man who exacts truth to the last degree from some powers of his nature, and allows other powers to make sport of him at their will. Then we have the tragedy of literature, of science, of art, — the intellect at work in utter disregard of the nature of which it is a part, separating itself more and more from the man, till at last the man

whose mental power commands us, crouches before us in the appeal of his moral nature to our charity or pity. This inconsistency may exist. It does exist. We are all conscious of it. If it be a painful consciousness, it may give us hope. It shows us that we have begun to feel at some point our capacity for the true. The untrue remains under increasing protest. If we can only keep up the struggle we shall win one sure result. Capacity will become character.

But our answer widens as it advances. The capacity for the true means more in the last result than character. It means also the ability to possess the things which are true. It means the true man plus something in sure possession which is true. It is not till he has made this gain that he passes from influence to power. Character gives influence, but, as Carlyle puts it, "it is the knowing ones who rule." But what is the knowledge which gives power? Is it anything else than the possession of the thing which is true, provided one knows its worth and how to use it? And the advance in knowledge, is it anything else than the gradual approximation to the truth?

"That virtue of originality," Ruskin says in his fine impatience, "which men so strain after is not newness, as they vainly think, it is only genu-

ineness. It all depends on the glorious faculty of getting to the spring of things and working out from that. It is the coolness and clearness and deliciousness of the water fresh from the fountain head opposed to the thick, hot, unrefreshing drainage from other men's meadows."

The newer thought is nothing unless it be the true thought. It is never the new which supersedes the old, it is the true which supersedes the old. If some men could only believe this, how quickly and surely would it deliver them from their fear of progress.

The new scientific theory which comes to abide, causing it may be much adjustment, is simply the theory which starts from a source nearer the heart of nature, and therefore having more force and reach. The new political or social principle, which is really able to reconstruct or to supplant, is simply the principle which is charged more thoroughly with the truth, with justice, that is, and freedom and righteousness. And the new interpretation of religion, from which men have the most to hope or to fear, according to their view of it, is the interpretation which comes from some vision of God.

The permanent value of the new truth of any sort can usually be measured by the certainty of knowledge of the man who holds it. When Paul

said of Christianity, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day," we at least can see that the movement of Christianity into the world had begun. A truth seldom begins to move until some man is able to stand behind it and say of it "I know," some Paul, some Galileo, some Luther. This dependence of truth upon men would be pathetic, were it not that God has set a great patience in the heart of nature and in the heart of humanity, even as He holds it in his own heart. But knowledge, to come back again to our exact thought, knowledge is simply the personal possession of the true. To ask therefore how much a man knows is to ask how much is true to him. Singularly enough we have been obliged to change the word to make sure of the fact. When we really wish to test a man's knowledge of a given thing, we are not so apt to say, Do you know it? as Do you believe it? We want a word which expresses sincerity, devotion, if need be sacrifice, some actual or possible commitment of the life to the fortune of the thing which is true. That is the test which the world applies to every "knowing" man. It is a perfectly fair test. And it can begin to be applied the moment one passes from study as an intellectual discipline to study as a means of know-

ledge. One can play chess without inviting questions which lie outside the skill of the game. But the moment one begins to investigate subjects of human concern the whole attitude of men toward him changes. The questions they ask reach back to motive and on to result. The tests all turn that way. Do you know this thing in principle, in fact, in some kind of reality? Do you know it to the point of believing in it? Can you trust it? Can you guarantee it by some sort of personal endorsement? Are you willing to stand by it and take the consequences?

Take up the superior callings, they all meet you with this one unswerving test. Law, for example, is in appearance the rule of precedent. Do you therefore expect to satisfy the law by memorizing it? Memory is of unusual value to the lawyer; but, as one of the greatest lawyers among our graduates once said to me, it is the first business of a lawyer to learn to forget. The mind cannot be so burdened with cases that it cannot revert at once and naturally to principles. The quick and sure return of the mind to principles, to the things known to be true, is the working test of the man who professes to know, be his knowledge the facts of science, or the principles of jurisprudence, or the truths of spiritual religion. In a recent conversation with a friend

in business, he remarked, that the places in the business world which are constantly in waiting for young men are those which demand the right handling of truth, truth in the form of facts. The man who can stand before a board of directors without confusion or without flinching in the assertion or proof of a fact is the man of an assured future. "I sometimes think," he said, "that one ought to have a training for business like the training for the pulpit."

It is here, as I have said, that there comes the first real consciousness of power. When one awakens to the certainty of his knowledge, if it be of things of recognized value, he begins to feel that men cannot afford to pass him by. He too has a place in the world. I think that I can understand, as I certainly honor, the sense of power in the man who feels the worth of money which he has earned, as that money begins to take the name and advantage of capital. Knowing that the ability to earn it may mean the ability to use it, he has the right to the consciousness of power. Can I make less account of the mental earnings of men as these begin to take the name and assume the responsibilities of knowledge? When a man becomes an authority does not he too become a capitalist? Let us understand that as the capacity for the true finds its first and just expression in

character, so does it find its second and equally just result in the possession of things which are true, a possession which is knowledge, a knowledge which may be power.

But our subject widens still as it advances. This capacity for the true lays upon its possessor the obligation to make the things which are true in him and to him true to other men. The ground of this obligation lies in the fact that the capacity for the true is universal. The capacity of the individual, however great it may be, is only a part of the capacity of the race. And he who does not recognize this capacity in others cannot estimate it properly in himself. To refuse, therefore, or to fail to satisfy this obligation is to stop short of leadership or of service, — you may take as you will the word of ambition or the word of duty. If a man stops with character he stops with influence. If he stops with knowledge he stops with the consciousness of power. Not until he believes in the capacity of all men for the true, and acts upon that faith, does he rise to the plane where he belongs, the plane of leadership or of service. This of course means action, the going out of self into men's lives. I do not pause now to dwell upon the motive of this outgoing force. I insist upon it as a part of the development in us of the capacity for the true. It has its own philosophy. I will

give you a paragraph which brings out with utmost clearness this philosophy of action. I quote from Canon Mozley in his treatise on the "Ruling Ideas in Early Ages": "The peculiar and superior force of an act, as compared with general character, is gained upon a principle which is perfectly intelligible. A great act gathers up and brings to a focus the whole habit and character of the man. The act is dramatic, while the man's habit or character is didactic only: and what is more, there is a limitation in character which there is not in an act. There is a boundlessness in an act. It is not a divided, balanced thing, but it is like an immense spring or leap. The whole of the man is in it, and at one great stroke it is revealed. A great act has thus a place in time: it is like a great poem, a great law, a great battle, any great event; it is a movement; it is a type which fructifies and reproduces itself."

There are two great motives which compel men to act, when you rise above those motives which belong to the struggle for existence. The first is the compulsion of an idea or of a love, the motive of the scientist or the christian. The second is faith in men, such a conception of humanity that one cannot resist the impulse to enter its life. It is this motive which is now before us. We are to make the things which are true in us and to us true to

others, because they have the like capacity with us for the true. This capacity is their argument, their appeal. I know how faithless and unbelieving we may become about the capacity of men for the true. I know too how quickly we may be shaken out of our faithlessness and unbelief. The mind of the world seems at times to grow drowsy and numb, but a word may be spoken which will make men think the world over. The heart or conscience of the world seems at times to become weak and cowardly, but a deed may be done which takes away fear, and makes men brave again the world over. You do not know when you open your morning paper that you may not read some paragraph, the report of one man's act, which will change the current of your thought for the day. It may be of such a kind as to change the thought of the civilized world. Wherever the story goes there may go with it the power to affect the thought, the speech, the very accent and tones of men.

Doubtless every one of us has his principles of exclusion. Something in humanity, near at hand or afar off, lies below recognition. Darwin drew the line at the lowest tribe among the South American Indians. "Mr. Darwin," said Admiral Sir James Sullivan, "had often expressed to me his conviction that it was utterly useless to send

missionaries to such a set of savages as the Fuegians, probably the very lowest of the human race. I had always replied that I did not believe any human being existed too low to comprehend the simple message of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. After some years Mr. Darwin wrote to me that the account of the mission showed that he had been wrong and I right, and he requested me to forward to the society an enclosed cheque for five pounds as a testimony of his interest in their good work."

The capacity for the true in human nature, — where will you draw the line at any virtue, or at any people? There is but one place where one may draw the line with certainty, and that is within himself. It is possible, I must again remind you, for one to so sin against his own nature, as to restrict, if not destroy, the capacity for the true. It is possible for a man to condemn himself — no one else can do it — to the isolation of the untrue. But outside that realm in which the individual is sovereign, I know of no restricted territory. Wherever I look in the universe of God I find written on every part — "He is a faithful Creator." Everywhere I see the signs of the true. The stars go right above us, and all things leading up to man tread their sure, unerring path. As I look above, or beneath, I dare not falter in my faith concerning man. He, too, must

have the capacity for the true. The saying must be right: the prophecy must be sure. "Which thing is true in him and in you."

Can there be any stronger challenge to our moral nature than that which comes to us so unexpectedly out of this ancient word — that we be true, that we get possession in things which are true, that we make the things which are true in us and to us true to others? It is one note in the ceaseless challenge to character, to knowledge, to faith. The challenge to character is as old as that first sense of sin which began the struggle for righteousness. The challenge to knowledge is as old as civilization and grows more urgent as "knowledge grows." The challenge to faith, faith in men as well as faith in God, is as old at least as Christianity. It is hard for the world to accept this challenge in its completeness. Men hesitate most before the call to faith. But in our strivings for character and for knowledge we do not satisfy the challenge. We cannot really hope to become true, we cannot really hope to possess ourselves of the things which are true, until we are willing and able to make the things which are true in us and to us, true to every man of equal rights in the truth.

# IX

## THE MORALLY WELL-BRED MAN

"He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" — MICAH vi, 8.

A TRAVELER of unusual discernment, who had had frequent opportunity to observe the bearing and habits of men in position, met recently the heir of one of our American men of fortune. "The young man," he remarked to a friend, "did not seem to me to be oppressed with the sense of his importance, but rather to be somewhat overweighted with the sense of his responsibility. He wore the expression, which one sometimes sees on the face of a prince, who does not seem to be quite sure of what the future has in store for him."

This single and almost chance observation would have no general value, did it not accord with the impression which many have, who know best the temper of the more serious-minded young men of the country. A change has been going on within the past generation, more evidently within the past decade, in the spirit in which young men of inheritance or of acquirement anticipate their future. The light-hearted, eager, confident ambi-

tion of earlier times has given place to a more careful, if not to a more anxious outlook. The volume of ambition has not lessened. There has been no decline in courage. But there is uncertainty where before there was assurance. The young man of to-day as he draws near to his responsibilities is not as sure as was his predecessor, of what he can do, nor in fact of what he ought to do.

There are certain reasons for this change in the habit of mind of our generation. In the first place, there are more young men who have much at stake than formerly. The number has greatly increased of those who have power of some kind in hand, some the power of fortune, some of education, some of position. Every one of these differs from the boy who starts from nothing and therefore has everything to gain and nothing to lose. The possession of power, whether it comes by inheritance, or, as is the case with the majority of college men, is earned by industry and sacrifice, develops caution rather than rashness or overconfidence. In the second place, the approach to one's future is not so clearly defined as formerly, certainly not the moral approach. No profession has the same definite moral significance which it had even a generation ago. There are more kinds of ministers and lawyers and doctors and teach-

ers than there were then. And there are new callings upon which we have not been able as yet to put a distinct moral valuation. One may reach almost any common end by different paths. Once it was law which led into politics or public life; now it is equally journalism, or successful business. In the third place the sense of the complexity of life is at first confusing. One does not easily become used to the vast and swift machinery of which he sees and feels the movement. There seems to be no chance for personal initiative or personal freedom. One is always conscious, I think, of a certain personal loss as he first enters the "world." He becomes at once a part of something. He is no longer his own individual self in its wholeness. And in the fourth place there is the overwhelming impression to-day of material power. What is a man, one man, in the presence of the vast combinations of wealth! The present impression of the power of money is, I believe, greater (to some minds very much greater) than the fact warrants. It is still the capable man who is in control of affairs, not capital, and he is quite as likely to have had no capital at the beginning except his brains, as to have been born a capitalist. But the first impression of material power is bewildering. The material seems to be in the ascendant everywhere.

It is not simply the spiritual, it is the human, which appears to be in subjection.

These and like causes create the state of mind to which I have referred. They introduce the element of uncertainty into all personal ambitions. They make it hard for a man to look clearly, steadily, and confidently into his future. And yet clearness, steadiness, and a good degree of confidence are the very results which education aims to secure. These are the characteristics of the well-bred man, on the intellectual and moral side. How shall we produce the well-bred man of this order, the man made ready for responsibilities, in so far as education can accomplish the result? I emphasize, in what I say to you, the part which moral agencies take in the necessary training of such men to-day. I do not know that precisely the same moral agencies would have been required, or would have sufficed, in other times. I discuss our own necessities and the directive moral forces at our command. The striking peculiarity of our times lies in the fact that the needful moral qualities and forces are entirely in evidence. "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

The morally well-bred man of to-day, the man

capable of responsibility, must be just. The apparent contention of the people is against inequality. I believe that this contention has no meaning, and therefore no force, except as in general terms, or in particular cases, it strikes at injustice. Men do not want the equality which makes them alike even in condition. I doubt if they care to be equally rich. It is evident that they do not care to be equally intelligent. What human nature cannot endure, at least human nature trained in the ways of modern democracy, is that one man should be rich at the price of another man's poverty, or that one man should be intelligent at the price of another man's ignorance. The thing which every one is sensitive about is injustice. The man whom everybody hates is first the unjust man, and then the man who, without being personally unjust, is willing to thrive upon any organized injustice. And so we get by indirection the thing which all want most, namely, justice; and also the man whom society values most, first the just man, and still more the man who is able to insure justice.

The requirement of my text is that a man shall "do justly." That accords with the popular demand. Public morality usually comes about through the infusion of more will into private morality. Public morality consists simply in

"doing" with the requisite courage and force on a large scale, what a great many men are doing in personal ways, and for personal results. No one can expect to succeed in anything which concerns many persons except as he brings into play a well-trained will. The dominant man everywhere is the persistent and determined man. Industrialism offers the special field for the development of this type of power. The captains of industry belong, without exception, so far as I know, to this class. It is surprising how quickly material forces fall into place under the mastery of the patient, but bold and constructive, mind. It is surprising how obstinate the forces are which confront the same type of mind in the field of moral action. The kind of will power which secures the present triumphs of industrialism is not necessarily of the first order. It by no means follows that the great organizers and promoters would succeed if they faced moral, in place of material, conditions. The men who in succession rule Wall Street might, and probably would, fail to reform New York. Indeed, when you leave out the most exacting moral requirements, or make them subordinate in the solution of any problem, you greatly simplify the problem. When you begin to ask questions about the successful man, you do not ask the hard questions, those which

are really trying and determinative, until you reach the moral issues involved, of which the most fundamental is justice. You ask if such a man is energetic, inventive, courageous? Yes. Is he faithful, exact, truthful? Yes. Is he honest, according to the standard of commercial honesty? Yes. Is he just? Does he consider the rights and interests of all who are legitimately concerned in his operations? Well, that is a new question. It is not understood that this is exactly a part of his business. I think that there are men who make justice in the broadest sense a part of their business. I think, however, that the common estimate of the successful man makes little account of this quality. And yet if you eliminate this quality, do you not see how much easier success may be? Do you not see that success acquired without the restrictions imposed by justice represents an inferior, because a less difficult, order of greatness? Do you not see that so long as it fails to meet those moral obligations which each advance necessitates, power must be classed as rude and elementary? There is no real gain in the transfer of power from the arts of war to the arts of peace unless the transfer carries with it a distinct moral gain. It is always the moral element, and usually it is justice, which has the last word to say, about a man, or an institution, or a nation.

And you can but notice that it is the assertion of this quality which brings men of position most quickly and effectively into the public confidence. Some of the men of to-day who are in most confidential and trustworthy relations with the people at large are the governors of the states. They stand in the public thought, not simply because of their office, but because of the many noble illustrations of its use; for justice, that quality which I am insisting upon, reaches so much farther, and means so much more than commercial honesty. There ought to be no reason why the higher interests of corporations should not coincide with the higher interests of the state. In the long run, I believe that it is a good business policy to work toward the people rather than away from them. And to this end I urge that the most profitable man, whoever he may be, or wherever he may be, is the just man. The man who fails to earn this reputation is not profitable, except for some immediate and secondary uses.

But the man well bred morally, capable, that is, of responsibility, under present demands, must have sympathy. My text says that he must "love mercy." I put sympathy in place of mercy because it is becoming so easy to satisfy the current sense of mercy. Without doubt our age will pass into history as the most merciful of all the ages. We

have taken severity out of our theories of life, and for the most part out of our practices. We have measured progress in religion, in law, in education, and in social development very largely by the growth of humane principles and methods. And we have carried the idea of mercy far out into the region of charity. We have studied the art of charity in its noblest forms. Almsgiving has yielded slowly but surely to methods of prevention and social betterment. This change in public sentiment has cost something, but the cost has fallen upon the generation which is now passing away. Mercy as an intellectual conception is an easy inheritance. No child of to-day struggles through the bitter experience of many children of earlier times in the thought of God. And mercy as an applied force has passed into the routine of organization. I have had occasion to say elsewhere that charity has become almost the pastime of the church.

What is the stronger term in which we need to express our action to make it match that of our immediate predecessors? I have said that it is sympathy. Sympathy is the word of democracy. Kings, yes despots, may be merciful, but sympathy in its social and political meaning is out of their reach. Sympathy is the fellow feeling which actuates men who have a common opportunity, as

well as a common need. Sympathy is the claim upon you of the man who is trying to help himself, much more than of the man who wants your help. Sympathy does not ask for your money, but for you. It asks you to put away your prejudices, to withhold your patronage, to make room for those who have earned their place at your side. Sympathy asks you to interpret your fellow men, to translate, it may be, their unspoken, or wrongly spoken thoughts, into appropriate speech, to make the word of violence the word of reason, to incorporate their aspirations and struggles and sacrifices into the social order.

No educated man is worthy of a place in a democracy who does not "love mercy" in this high sense. The first business of education on its human side is to enable — I think that I would better say to compel — one to recognize and honor the self-respecting man beside him. I go further. It is our business as educated persons to think of men in large terms. The Puritan had his way of idealizing the individual, which worked grandly in its time. He put the man with the right cause against the world. "One with God was a majority." Phillips Brooks made his one man a part of a redeemed and glorified humanity. He resolved men into man and then poured out upon his ideal man the wealth of his heart in passionate love.

Take your own way of idealizing men. The ways are various, so various that they are almost contradictory. But do not fail to accomplish yourselves in the art. Beware of the revenge of humanity upon the man who thinks meanly of it. The penalty is pharisaism. The pharisee is the outcast of history. By all the traditions and standards of Christianity he is the type of the ill-bred man, the man who disowns and dishonors his kind.

The formula of my text for the training of the morally well-bred man, the man capable of meeting his responsibilities, reaches its conclusion in a virtue which in one form or another, or under one name or another, we greatly admire in others if we do not always covet it. The religious expression of it is humility, the humility of faith, or as my text has it, the walking humbly with God. In common speech we call it unconsciousness, the unconsciousness of one who loses himself in his deed; or we call it reverence, the attitude of one who bows before the power that is above him; or we call it faith, the habit of mind of one who allies himself with God through obedience and trust. We can measure the worth of this quality by its absence. We want the sufficient man; we do not want the self-sufficient man. We look with feelings varying from disappointment to disgust

upon all exhibitions of self-consciousness, vanity, conceit, and self-assertion. A man can almost undo a great deed by his personal bearing in regard to it. There have been brave soldiers who were vain, but we like better the modesty of Grant. There have been rare scholars who had the pride of learning, but we like better the humility of Darwin. There have been able rulers who honestly believed that they were the State, but we like better the noble faith of Washington which led to his renunciation of power. When a man has come to think that he is necessary to a cause, the probability is that he has ceased to be necessary. We can hold second places in life without humility; we cannot long hold the first places without it. The fundamental difference between the self-made man and a man trained in the schools ought to appear in the greater humility of the scholar. If this does not appear, then he has missed the spirit of his calling. If books, and teachers, and the traditions of learning have any value to the spirit, it lies in this, that they make it reverent in the presence of the mind of the world. And yet, it is very difficult, I grant, to insure good breeding at this point in our cŏlleges. The vice of the old-time college was provincialism. The college man was in a world of his own. His knowledge was not more of the

common kind, but different. His associations grew narrower from year to year. Even his humor was unintelligible, as it still is in a measure, to the outer world. The vice of the modern college is publicity, or to be more discriminating, a part of its life is under a fierce light, while another part is in shade. The college of to-day is under an unequal and contradictory impulse. The scholar lacks outward stimulus; the athlete has an excess of it. The scholar has this advantage, that relatively he has more recognition to expect in his immediate future. The athlete has discounted to a large degree his immediate future. He passes at once out of the light into the shade. This is a severe test to the average man. I wonder that so many pass it so successfully. One would expect to find a larger proportion than really exists of college graduates who crave notoriety, or who, for lack of outward stimulus, relapse into comparative inactivity. Still the publicity which attends so considerable a part of college life makes it exceedingly difficult, as you all know, to develop the spirit of patient, independent, and unostentatious work. The publicity of which I am speaking is responsible in part, I think, for the impatience and haste of college men to be in the world. The world is so near, it is so open, it has so much in common with the life

which one already knows, that it seems a waste of time to delay the transfer. This impatience may exist together with the uncertainty of which I spoke at the beginning, just as the same uncertainty may underlie the self-possession of the man of the world.

But whatever the present difficulties may be in cultivating the spirit of humility in our colleges, we have no option as to the duty. The charm, the persuasion of all high endeavor and action is the free, unconscious spirit which pervades it, and this freedom of spirit is a sign of strength. Humility is the child of Faith, and Faith dowers her child with matchless gifts. Here lies, as I have often reminded you, the glory of the true religious life. "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted." I make no closing plea for any formal religion, but I do plead now as always for the religious spirit, for the spirit which makes a man aware of the fact that he is living in God's world, that he is a son of the Everlasting Father, and that here as hereafter he is to know himself by the rights, by the duties, and by the glory of his sonship. Seek, I pray you, moral distinction. Be not content with the commonplace in character any more than with the commonplace in ambition or intellectual attainment. Do not expect that you will make any lasting, or any very strong

impression on the world through intellectual power without the use of an equal amount of conscience and heart. The laws of your being are against the experiment. Accept the moral law as you accept the law of gravitation. If you believe in justice with all your might, allowing no second beliefs, you will be just. If you love mercy with a passionate love, you will be merciful. If you have faith to the degree of humility, you will walk "sure-footedly" in the world. Make the brave, determined, intelligent endeavor to go right in your way among men. In so doing you will widen somewhat the pathway of justice, mercy, and faith for those about you.

# X

## MORAL MATURITY

"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, even so do ye also to them: for this is the law and the prophets." — MATTHEW vii, 12.

JESUS said that this saying of his was the law and the prophets, because to the men of his time these made the moral standard. But to us, his words have become more than the law and the prophets. We know the law and the prophets, and we know that they do not "find us" as these words of Jesus "find us."

What is the ground of the advance? Why is it that this saying of Jesus has outrun all other moral teachings and taken possession of the consciences of men? Because it really satisfies the consciences of men. We can see that it appeals to us more and more as we advance toward moral maturity. The law still speaks to us as capable of responding to authority. The prophets still speak to us as capable of responding to ideals. Jesus speaks to us as capable of responding to the sense of the human in ourselves and in all men. And it is, I believe, through this deepening sense of the human that we reach moral maturity. After we have passed under authority, after we have felt

the power of ideals, then Jesus can say to us as we begin to measure those forces which make up the play of human life, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, even so do ye also to them."

I wish to speak to you about Jesus' test of moral maturity. The discussion of this subject seems to me to be timely, for, as I believe, the chief lack in the moral power of our time lies in a certain immaturity. Good men among us are not inactive or cowardly. Whenever they fail it is usually for want of breadth and consistency of action. Reforms are carried, but they are not held. When the church takes the field it is apt to lack that magnificent steadiness and unity which mark the well-seasoned army.

How do we reach moral maturity? Not by abiding always in the commandments. The literalism of obedience will surely leave us immature morally. Not by living altogether in the freedom and in the comparative irresponsibility of our ideals. The moral power of the mere idealist is too much like that of the amateur. When we take it into the world men call it academic. The order of moral advance is from commandments to ideals, and then from ideals to those actual personal standards which are wrought out in the contact of man with man. When we have proved

by actual trial that we are willing and able to do to men whatsoever we would that men should do to us, we have reached, according to Jesus' standard, moral maturity.

Let me remind you that we belong to a generation, in which, if the comparison is taken with other times, personal standards are more influential than commandments or ideals. The present age is not capable of expressing itself very effectively in the language of authority or in the language of inspiration. The characteristic of all ages which have been greatest in authority or inspiration, has been a certain overstatement of truth, a certain spiritual abandon in the utterance of it, sometimes expressing itself with the utmost daring of logic, sometimes in the like outburst of emotion. The Westminster Confession accepted and affirmed the sovereignty of God to the bitter end. The Declaration of Independence accepted and affirmed the equality of man far beyond the reach of modern democracy. Neither one of these could have been written in our time. We suffer them to abide with us, only as we revise and qualify them. We do not find men saying much or thinking much about a good many things which were once authoritative and quickening, and which will doubtless reappear in due time in honor and power. For the present, virtue seems

to lie in men and especially in their way of doing virtuous things. We seem to be more concerned to find the righteous man, or to make men capable of freedom, than we are concerned about righteousness or freedom. These terms themselves are less influential than they have been at some other times, apart from the deeds for which they stand. In a word, we are less responsive to what the best men are thinking, and more sensitive to the actions of men good or bad. Hence the peculiar urgency to-day of those personal standards of conduct and duty which are embodied in the saying of Jesus, that we make ourselves capable of doing to men as we would have men do to us.

And now that we have this saying of Jesus in its relation to the law and the prophets, let us try to understand the significance of the advance which He would have us make from commandments and ideals to the more personal standards of conduct and duty. In the first place, this advance of moral standard is significant because of the risk which it involves. It is a departure from a fixed standard. Law is fixed, and the ideal from its nature can never fall below a certain level. To make the sense of right or justice or charity as applied to one's self the moral standard, puts conduct evidently on a sliding

scale. The sense of right and justice and charity is by no means equal among men. The application of the standard may work to the advantage of the inferior man, the man who is morally lower in his desires or purposes or methods of action. I challenge a man to fight a duel. He replies that that is not the way to settle a matter of right or wrong. But if I send the challenge, the probability is that I should be perfectly willing that he should do to me as I have done to him. I am the inferior man, with the lower standard. A man who is financially competent refuses to join with others in securing better educational advantages for a community. "But," as others say to him, "it is for the good of your children." To which he replies, with the arrogance of the self-made man, "Have I not prospered with my education? My education is good enough for my children"; the inference being that it is good enough for anybody's children. This man does not ask the community to do for him or for his children any more than he is willing to contribute as his part toward the public good. He is simply the inferior man with the lower standard. And the application of the rule may work in like manner to the seeming advantage of the merely conventionalized man, the man who has become so formalized socially or politically or religiously that he really

wants nothing better than that which can come to him through his set, or through his party, or through his sect. Progress must always wait for those who do not want the best things for themselves.

Here, then, is the risk involved in the advance from the more impersonal to the more personal standards of conduct and duty. It seems to put a certain power into the hands of the morally undeveloped or morally unprogressive person. But in counting the risk it is to be remembered that the same person is not usually susceptible to high ideals, and that he may be evasive of law. The conventionalized man is seldom open to ideals, and the man who is utterly lacking in public spirit has no liking for those laws which are the embodiment of public spirit.

But in the second place this moral advance from commandments and ideals to the more personal standards of conduct and duty is significant because it brings in a standard of practicable severity. There is no finer discipline than for a man to compel himself to do the things which he would expect others in like circumstances to do, or to refrain from doing the things which he would expect others in like circumstances to refrain from doing. There is very little laxity about a man's judgment of the conduct or duty of others

in like condition with himself. His judgment is quite likely to be clear, definite, and unwavering. It is a wholesome business for one to turn a trained and practiced judgment upon himself. Consistency requires him to do this, and consistency is inexorable in its demands. It is not easy to meet or to evade the charge of inconsistency, — the inconsistency, that is, between one's judgment of others and one's judgment of himself. Nothing hurts a sane and honest man so much as to find himself engaged in special pleading for himself. He cannot be tolerant of self-excuses from duty which he would not accept from another, nor of justification of his own conduct which he would not accept from another in respect to like conduct. The sense of inconsistency is about the most painful sense which a man can hold in his conscience. Conscience may relent somewhat toward one who falls away from his ideals, or who even violates a law, but it has no mercy for a man who does not play fair with his fellow men. The moral sensitiveness of our time is due very largely to the disturbed relations between man and man. If society were at rest we should have more inward peace. As it is, one can hardly read of a great social disturbance, a strike, an outbreak, a war, without asking himself, What is my part in it? We instantly feel that somebody

is not doing to others as he would have others do to him; but so complicated is the whole social structure that we cannot separate the wrongdoer, and set him apart even from ourselves. Over against the physical suffering which is associated with the great inequalities in social condition, there is a growing amount of very real mental and moral suffering on the part of those who feel, if they cannot remedy, every unrighted wrong. So definite and so severe is the penalty which inheres in the social system, as definite and severe as any penalty which inheres in law or in ideals of duty.

A still greater significance however, let me say in the third place, attaches to this moral advance from commandments and ideals to personal standards of conduct and duty, because of its educating power. A personal standard is an improvable thing, for the standard and the man are one and the same. The standard is the man desiring and purposing the best things for himself in order that he may make no inferior demands upon society. I have shown you the danger to society from the inferior man, the man of low objects and methods, who excuses himself from doing much for others because he asks little from others. On the other hand, great is the advantage to society from the man who expects much,

because he gives much. He sets the standard of giving and of receiving. "Whatsoever," Jesus says, "ye would that men should do to you, even so do ye also to them." That one word "whatsoever" measures the difference between men. With some men it is a little word meaning no more than the barter of petty trade. With other men it is a full word standing for the exchange of the richest products of mind and heart in the market place of the world. "Whatsoever ye would." How much "would ye," and what shall it be? It is one part of the business of education to answer these questions. It is, perhaps, the chief business of education to create the asking, and expectant, but discriminating mind. There is less danger from the over-asking, the grasping mind, than there is from the mind without desires and without demands. Discrimination is the after part of education. First the creation of wants, the kindling of desires, then the refinement of the awakened and enlarged nature.

One cannot overestimate the place of moral education in the enforcement of Christ's rule of life. It would have little meaning without that behind it. It might even become a dangerous rule, the means by which the inferior man might level down society. For a man to satisfy the first condition of the rule he must be able to raise

the level of capacity in men around him: and one way in which he may accomplish this end is simply by standing in his own person for the things which men ought to have, and having which they may be willing to exchange. I cannot overestimate the practical value of this educational test which Christ's rule applies to our lives. Moral values are never inactive. The man of moral force is never absent. His presence is always felt. He is at work when he is silent and when he is at rest. His better tastes gradually refine others, his larger desires quicken their interests, his judgments increase the weight of public opinion. You can easily test the principle. What made the difference in the early attempts at the colonization of this country? Simply the intellectual and moral standard of the colonists themselves. Some wanted perishable, others wanted imperishable things. These all fixed for themselves, and for all who came after them, the valuation of their respective enterprises. What makes the differences in communities which are alike in outward conditions? Simply the presence or the absence of men of large and compelling wants. What makes the difference at different times in a given profession? It is simply the question whether the leaders are putting the profession to its largest uses or are content with

secondary results. Within the past decade the profession which has made by far the greatest advance is the profession of medicine. It has no inherent advantage above the other professions. It is simply asking more questions, investigating more problems, daring to do braver things. There is no escape from the test in any department of life, or on the part of any man. To him that hath it shall be given, and he shall have abundantly. Men delight to give to the man who is intent on the true riches. His desires, purposes, and struggles, as well as his achievements, enrich the common life.

It is just here that we see, in the simple presence of men of great and contagious desires, a certain charm and power in unconscious above conscious leadership. It is not the men who are looking behind to see if they have a following, who are our leaders. It is the men who are moving straight on to their ends in the singleness and joy of their work: the investigator, baffled but undaunted, the reformer as indifferent to flattery as to criticism, the genuine seeker after the truth, whose life says to us as he moves on — "that I may know him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings." There is no power so great or so influential as the simple power which comes of minding one's

own business, provided it be a great and an unselfish business. What matters it to me that another man's work is not mine? If he is doing it grandly I can do mine the better.

But the chief significance of this advance from commandments and ideals to personal standards of conduct and duty lies in the right and power of the moral initiative which it confers upon the stronger and better souls. What right have we to interfere with the superstition or ignorance or weakness of men, with anything in fact that falls short of the wickedness of the world? What is the justification of the reformer, the philanthropist, the missionary? Why should one fight other men's battles? Why should one stir in other men discontent with their condition? Why should any one go anywhere on any errand among men where he has not been asked to go, and where his presence is not altogether welcome? What business has a man in any community to be public-spirited? All these and like questions have but one answer, namely, the moral right of one man to put himself in another man's place to the end of his relief or gain. It was in the exercise of this right that Jesus came to men. He claimed no other right for his presence here. "Ye know," Paul says, "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he

became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." It is by virtue of this right that men and nations which have taken the christian way have wrought in the interest of the weak, the oppressed, the darkened, and the depraved. The right may be exercised without judgment or tact, and expose those who use it to just criticism, but the right itself has earned its place among the high privileges open to all who are able to honor them.

There is but one recognized objection to the exercise of this right. The strong man who puts himself in place of the weak may superimpose himself upon the weaker brother. He may fail to interpret his real needs, or to satisfy his possible desires. He may patronize, not help. He may change, not develop, the life he seeks to reach. And the objection grows in weight when it can be fitly applied to a nation or to the church. It is not the business of a nation of any type to set up feeble imitations of itself, but rather to guarantee normal political development. It is not the business of the church possessed of the missionary spirit to convert men to forms of church government or to specific creeds, but rather to the reality and freedom of Christianity. In this fact lies the growing delicacy of the political and religious relations of the Western to the Eastern

peoples. By a singular providence it is the task of the most modern Christianity to address itself to the most ancient of peoples, peoples which had been brooding over the problem of human destiny before we were born. Not altogether in vain had been that long searching after God if haply He might be found. The religious experience of the great non-christian races is not a thing to be ignored, least of all to be insulted. By so doing, men may do despite to the spirit of God. Many of the spiritual qualities which have been slowly and painfully wrought in comparative darkness are yet to shine forth in the light of Christendom. It has not been revealed that Western Christianity is the final Christianity. It has not been revealed that the perfect man in Christ Jesus is to come out of the North or the South, out of the East or the West. When Phillips Brooks gave his memorable sermon on a fourth of July in Westminster Abbey, he said that the cry of one nation to another is, "Show us your man." Let our Western Christianity show its man, but not as the final type. Let our Western democracy declare its principles among the nations, but not assume that it is the perfect law of liberty. We have yet some things to learn about government and much more about Christianity. But with the qualification of a just humil-

ity, and of a reasonable tact, there is nothing to qualify the right of the moral initiative. The order is upon us, according to the value which we set on what is to us a gospel, — that we go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.

But you may ask, Is there any large opportunity to-day for the use of the moral initiative? Is there the like opportunity to that which called out the brave word of young Mills to his classmates at Williams, — "We ought to carry the Gospel to dark and heathen lands and we can do it if we will"? Is there the like opportunity to that which called out the strenuous word of the early anti-slavery agitator, "I will not equivocate, I will not compromise, I will not retreat a single inch, and I will be heard"? Is there the like opportunity to those who brought in the movements for prison reform, factory legislation, or the greater educational and charitable developments of more recent times? Let us think again, not overlooking things near at hand, and the question answers itself. Is there a city in the land which is not calling upon its citizens to take the moral initiative in its behalf and in their own behalf? Has there not been a steadily increasing, and as yet unsatisfied demand for the moral initiative in the interest of peace in the economic

world? A well-known political leader was credited with the saying that he would rather be instrumental in settling permanently the labor disturbances of the country than in gaining the presidency. If he could have satisfied that ambition, he would have made for himself a place of honor in the land which any president might envy. Opportunities for moral initiative lie at hand in any really vital calling in which a man may engage, for we are to remember that every advance made through the physical and intellectual initiative of our time raises its own moral issues. There is not a business into which a man can enter which he will not at some time have the chance to make morally better. There is no business so good in itself that it cannot always be made better by the impulse of the moral initiative. That is just what the ministry always needs. Let no man ever rely upon his business, even though it be that of saving men, to save himself. Back in himself there must lie by the grace of God the saving power, the power to transmute commandments and ideals into a living force.

I have been speaking to you of that moral advance, that advance toward moral maturity, which Jesus urges upon us in his familiar words, that we do to others as we would have others do to us.

I have tried to take these words out of the religious commonplace into which they have fallen, and to set them again in the place in which they belong in the teachings of Jesus. "Think not that I am come," He said, "to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" — and this is their fulfillment, that "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, even so do ye also to them." And this is the way of their fulfillment.

Do not let the inferior man, be he the man of lower aims, or the merely conventionalized man, bring you down to the level of his obligations. Do not shrink from applying to yourselves the judgments which you may fairly apply to others. Train yourselves to desires and tastes, to intellectual and moral necessities, which will set the standards of giving and receiving in your own communities and in your professions. Above all, earn for yourselves the right and the power of taking the moral initiative among men to the bettering of the common work, to the helping of the world, to the saving of the lost.

Let us keep the commandments; let us not be satisfied with keeping the commandments. Let us cherish our ideals: let us not be satisfied with visions of duty. Christianity is the religion of the actual, that is, the religion of the human. Its

great qualities are justice, courage, aspiration, and sacrifice. So far as we know, the sphere of its working is this world.

Let me put before you in concrete form Christ's own interpretation of his words. There came to Him one day, as you recall, a man well trained in the commandments, with his mind open to ideals, but unsatisfied, still seeking some higher end. "Good Master, what shall I do?" "Go, sell that thou hast and give to the poor and come follow me." Come out from behind the commandments, take the open field, dream no longer, come with me among men. And he said no, sorrowfully, but effectively. He made what Dante called the "grand refusal." Doubtless the vision of the greater duty came to him again and again, but for aught we know he dwelt as aforetime within the safety of the commandments. Had he met the opportunity of that day with Jesus, his name might have been as familiar to us as the name of Paul. Perhaps his acceptance of Jesus' call might have made Paul unnecessary. The man failed, as you see, just where we are failing. His moral power never came to maturity. It never won him a place or a name among men. It never made him distinctly a christian, a follower of Christ and co-worker with Him.

He represents the great majority of well-trained

and well-intentioned men who never come to moral maturity. And yet the words of Jesus are becoming more practicable, not less practicable. Men and nations are slowly learning the better way. The morality of the civilized world is not as crude and raw, or as visionary as it was a century or even a generation ago. In spite of social conflicts, in spite of wars, men and nations are more patient with one another, more sensitive to the wrong, even when they do wrong, more capable of putting themselves, man by man, or nation by nation, in another's place. I count it the great moral obligation of all believing men to have faith in the working power of Christ's sayings. They will be no more true a hundred years hence than they are to-day, but we can make them more evidently true before we are done with them. And to this end, keep your faith, I pray you, in men. Faith in God has been defined as trusting Him against appearances. Believe in men against appearances. Do not take men at their word when they talk below themselves. Use the true, never the false, in human nature, and persist in doing this. So shall you gain access, every one of you in his own way, to the heart of humanity. So too shall you get your return from the heart of humanity. Action and reaction are

equal in the moral as in the physical world. "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, shall men give into your bosom."

# XI

## THE SATISFACTIONS OF LIFE IN THE MIDST OF ITS CONTRADICTIONS

"He hath made everything beautiful in its time: also he hath set eternity in their heart, yet so that man cannot find out the work that God hath done from the beginning even to the end." — ECCLESIASTES iii, 11.

Do you know of any bolder setting of human life than lies outlined in these successive statements, — the ceaseless changes which make up the attractiveness of the world, the unalterable sense of the permanent in the heart of man, and the mystery which broods alike over the changeable and the permanent? Here we have stated without the slightest reserve all those conditions which produce the contradiction of life as we know it; but what a glorious contradiction it is! What condition would you change? Would you make the world less attractive? Would you shorten man to the measure of time rather than of eternity? Would you break the mystery and let a man know the things which God knows? No. The glory of human life is in its contradictions, not apparent simply but real, and the immediate end of human life is to find satisfaction in them.

Let me speak to you of the Satisfactions of Life, the satisfactions which you may reasonably expect to find in your lives, in the midst of the contradictions in which you are to live.

You will agree with me when I say that it makes a vast difference to any man to what word he commits his future. Contentment, for example, is a rare word, but not the word through which to plan a career. Success is a fascinating word, a word of leadership, but not the word to put in charge of a man's soul. We want a word which will not restrain any legitimate power, and we want a word which will not mock us with the goal to which it may bring us. I do not know of any word which it is really worth while for any man to put before himself except satisfaction. What if a man is contented, and unsatisfied? What if a man is successful, tremendously successful, and unsatisfied?

But you ask me, Is satisfaction a practical word? Does it stand for things within reach today? Can we really do better than to aim at contentment, or at success, and take the chance of satisfaction?

Let me answer your question by saying that as the world has outgrown the discontent of mediævalism it is just as surely outgrowing the smug contentment of modern materialism. I say this in

full view of the open worship of success and of successful men. Mediævalism is a lost cause, and modern materialism is a waning cause. You cannot recall the one, you cannot long detain the other. The better man among us, the man who is beginning to lead the way to better things, is the man who has "come to himself," who has recovered his place in the world, who has felt the stirring of that "eternity" which has been set in his heart, and who therefore sees that it is equally foolish to protest against the attractiveness of the world, and to surrender himself recklessly to it. I will try to make this fact plain to you, not by example, but by showing you some of the sources of satisfaction which are opening to men in the world as we may know it.

One present source of satisfaction lies in the growing power to interpret the world. In other words, this is becoming again the scholar's world. And this means in turn that the outer world which is at times so satisfying to the senses, and at other times so unsatisfying, is becoming a source of consistent satisfaction to the intellectual life. He hath made everything beautiful? No. Some things are terribly ugly. He hath made everything beautiful *in its time.* The word of the modern scholar is order. He puts things into their place. The thing which is ugly here may take on beauty there. Under

his rearrangement Nature is no longer a creature of passions and moods, but of powers working to appointed ends. He sees the reason of her wastes and of her economics. He learns by patient observation the law of her times and seasons, that there is "a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted; a time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together; a time to break down, and a time to build up." And as he reads nature so he reads history. He no longer revels in battles, but he sees their place in the order of human events. Here too there is "a time to kill, and a time to heal; a time for war, and a time for peace." Human nature cannot get into shape, any more than nature can, without cost. The price of all movement, of all advance, is sacrifice of some kind. The deadly thing among nations, as in nature, is stagnation. The most serious judgment passed upon any people, a judgment which we of to-day can well understand and apply, is the prophetic word spoken concerning Moab. "Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and he hath settled on his lees, and hath not been emptied from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into captivity: therefore his taste remaineth in him, and his scent is not changed." Now the outcome of education, certainly of the higher education, is not the disciplined mind, but the man himself

made capable of using his mind to satisfying ends. The educated man is not simply the sharpened man, able to work with keener edge among his fellows, in the ways and among the things where they are working. Modern education means insight, method, the power to interpret; and if a man chooses to turn his back upon these things, he turns his back upon the best part of his training, with the probable result that the end reached is some kind of success, without satisfaction. It is a melancholy thing to see an educated man in the world of to-day altogether gone astray intellectually.

Another present source of satisfaction in life lies in the widening opportunity for a man to communicate himself to the world, to make his personal contribution to its permanent value. The fact that it is the habit of this age to express its values in commercial terms does not narrow the opportunity. There have been ages in which a man could give only himself. We have this heritage in some of the older professions in which the personal element is still the dominant element, — the ministry, medicine in some of its services, teaching, and art in its deepest expression. And they still have the advantage in this, that personal power can be most easily capitalized, and can be used with the most certainty. But suppose that a

man wishes to give at a second remove from himself, how abounding are the opportunities, provided he will acquire the necessary capital — money, position, or a following — and still hold to his purpose. The danger is that he will lose his purpose, if not himself, somewhere in the process. I suppose that many of you intend to make money, and that not one of you intends to end as a simple getter of money. You propose to yourselves some kind of beneficent action which will increase the value of the world to others. Your intention shows that you see the opportunity. All that you need is to begin to act as soon as you have the means of acting, and before you lose the motive power to action. Very few men are able to hold a virtue without exercising it. Recognize the fact at once, and never lose sight of it, that a thousand ways are open to you for communicating yourselves to the world, to join in that movement which is now plain and well defined of making the world in all its peoples self-supporting, of enlarging its useful resources, of refining its power, of saving it. And all this, you and others like you will be able to do because you belong to the permanent order of the world. You have within you that strange, solemn, joyous, powerful sense which this old-time writer called "eternity." He hardly knew whether to call it eternity or the world itself, it was something

so great and abiding, so imperishable. But there it was, set in the heart of man, and if he would recognize and honor it, it would help him to do lasting things. Man may seem to himself at times a pilgrim and a stranger in the earth, but he is not a transient. He goes, but he leaves behind him the fact of his presence. Nature cannot eradicate it. You visit Greece. You find there at least four civilizations buried in her soil. There if anywhere Matthew Arnold may sing the song of the triumph of nature over man.

> "Race after race, man after man,
> Have thought that my secret was theirs,
> Have dreamed that I lived but for them,
> That they were my glory and joy, —
> They are dust, they are changed, they are gone,
> I remain."

Yes, nature remains as beautiful as ever in that land of men, but man also remains. The imperishable presence of his past is there, it is here, it is everywhere. Nature holds the grave of the man she buried with his works, but *he* is not there, he is risen, his spirit is in all the world. He has inhabited every age since his own, and has ruled the best. Alas! for the generation which has no room for him, unless it can learn from some other source the satisfaction of communicating the imperishable spirit of a race to the world.

I cannot part company with this thought with-

out suggesting to you a kindred source of satisfaction, if you are really seeking satisfying ends, in the growing companionship of like-minded men. I suppose that there is no satisfaction so great as that which comes to a man who stands alone, or thinks he stands alone, in his witness to a righteous cause. The figure of the prophet with the cry on his lips, "I alone am left," is not pathetic, it is majestic. But such satisfaction is rare. It is limited to individuals, and to those only in infrequent generations. We find our ordinary satisfactions in our fellowships. Like-mindedness is the secret of fellowship. And the number of like-minded people who are weary of show and pretense, who want sincerity in social life as they want reality in thought, or honesty in business, is greatly on the increase. I believe that the number is under-estimated because of our reticence on serious subjects. We are not yet set free from the reign of cynicism and distrust and unbelief which marked the advent of materialism. We are still loath "to speak our minds" except in criticism. But let a man speak according to the sincerity of his convictions or in the simplicity of his faith, be it among the many or, what is far more difficult, among the few, and straightway heart answereth to heart as face answereth to face in the water.

I was talking recently with a gentleman who was a guest at the dinner given to Herbert Spencer when he visited this country. Most of the guests were agnostics. Mr. Beecher, who was an admirer of Mr. Spencer, was also a guest. The after-dinner speaking, begun by Mr. Spencer, was chiefly, as my friend said, along the line of negation, and as it continued it became depressing. Mr. Beecher was the last speaker. Without controversy, but with sincerity, he asserted the rights of the spirit. Gradually but surely men began to respond to his words. It was deep answering to deep, till at the close the whole company rose with one accord and hailed the speaker with what seemed to my friend to be the very passion of their souls.

It is, of course, obvious to say that we cannot take any sure satisfaction in life without at least the courage to face the great mystery in which we live and work. Faith has a better office for us than courage, though courage is a considerable part of faith. Faith is actually the product, varying in its parts according to the individual, of reason and courage. And this statement in no wise contravenes the assertion of Scripture that faith is the gift of God. What greater gifts can God bestow upon man as a religious being than reason and courage, — reason that he may know

his rights in the universe, and courage that he may defend them; reason that he may have access to truth, and courage that he may enter in and possess it; reason that he may be kept from superstition and error and folly, and courage that he may not fall away into indifference and ease of soul. I would have you believe that there was never a better time than now for the exercise of a rational and courageous faith. True, as I said at the beginning, the contradictions of life are very evident and very real to us. But, as I said also, they add to the glory of human life as we know it. The problem of faith is not so simple to us as it was to the mediævalist. He simply went into his closet, and shut his door on the world. There was nothing for him to do there but to speculate. His mind grew curious, impatient of mystery. We accept mystery. It is to us the atmosphere which keeps the earth soft as with showers, and the world fresh and young. We are great searchers, but we are not curious. We are trying to find out the work of God, but we are not asking, I think, unnecessary or improper questions. And in our search we are coming nearer than men have ever come to the great underlying unity. If everything in the world is beautiful in its time, if there is order here, there must be order everywhere. If you have found the

arc, you can cast the circle. That is the business of faith. Reason traces the line inch by inch. Faith discovers the curve and projects it.

It seems to me that our age is the most reverent of all the christian ages in its thinking, following most closely the method of the great Teacher. He never broke the silences of God. He kept the mystery. But He taught men how to reason from the seen to the unseen. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "If God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven; shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" "Love your enemies and do them good and lend, never despairing, and your reward shall be great: and ye shall be sons of the Most High." It was this method of teaching religious truth and religious life which the apostle of Jesus' own heart adopted, and which enabled him to utter, as if in common speech, the calmest and yet the most triumphant word of the christian faith. "Now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him."

Such, then, are some of the sources of a satisfying life. But if a man is unsuccessful, you will say, will he be satisfied? No, I think not. He may fall back into contentment, (no mean place,)

but satisfaction is a very positive, and active, and efficient state. It assumes employment, progress, the full action of all powers within us, and therefore the expectation if not the assurance of success. To say that a very successful man may be a very unsatisfied man, is far from saying that an unsuccessful man will be, or can be, a satisfied man. Success is the word of achievement. Let us guard it, but never abridge it. Let us be sure that through all the excitement and joy of achievement there runs the deep undertone of satisfaction.

I would not have you think so meanly of your time, as to suppose that you have nothing more to expect from it than contentment or unsatisfying success. You may go wrong in your way in the world, — may God keep you from that, — but I would not have you blunder in your thought of the world. I would not have you think of the world that is to be yours as identical with that which we are even now outgrowing. The modern world, as you are to know it, is not, or will not long be, the world which marked the sudden shift from mediævalism. The reaction is spent. Neither is it the world of raw force, and of rank material power, as men knew it at first. The noise and smoke of its work, its sudden and unstable wealth, its pride and vain glory, its impossible art, its

commercialized morals, its crude, self-sufficient, unbelieving man, all these are fast going the way of their kind. These do not make up the world of to-morrow, the world in which your achievements are to be ranked, and in which you are to be measured. You are to know a world which will have ample room in it for the intellectual life, for rewarding action of every kind, for sincere and satisfying companionship, and for faith. Do not miss your place in it. Do not live out of date. Make your own generation. Take the better fortune of your own time. And to do this, learn to think rightly of it. Be sure therefore that you think rightly of yourselves, for as you think of yourselves you will estimate your world. If God has set some great and abiding thing in your heart, if He has set "eternity" there, and you recognize it and are true to it, He will not mock you with an unsatisfied life, either here or hereafter.

## XII

## SECOND USES OF MEN — THE RECOVERY OF PERSONAL POWER

"He made it again another vessel." — JEREMIAH xviii, 4.

THE word of the Lord, which usually came to this prophet through direct inspiration, came to him at one time saying, "Arise, and go down to the potter's house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words." The prophet thus describes the object-lesson which he was sent there to study. The potter was "making a work on the wheels," that is, he was working out a design in the clay, shaping it according to the object which he had in mind. But the work was not successful. "The vessel that he made of the clay was marred in the hand of the potter." Then the prophet saw that the potter, instead of flinging away the clay out of which came the imperfect work, — "the marred vessel," — took again the same clay, moulded it afresh, put it again upon the wheel, and made it another vessel.

The object-lesson, as you see, was very simple and very plain. The moral which Jehovah drew from it was equally plain and explicit, almost impatient in its tone. "Have not I the right to

deal with men and with nations as this potter has dealt with this clay? Must I fling away a man or a nation if marred in the making? If there is repentance shall I not forgive, and if I forgive shall I not seek to restore?"

We will understand then, as the outcome of this prophetic lesson, that in the plan of God there are second uses for men who fail of the first intention of God in their lives. Personal power, when abused, or reduced, or wasted, may be to a degree, and to some worthy end, recovered. I do not know how we could live without this assurance. The venture of life is not with any of us the venture of perfection. A world in which no provision had been made for failures, or for those moral disasters which might otherwise leave us the wrecks of sin, would be to all of us an impossible world. When we sin, however grievous may be our sin, we need more than forgiveness, however assuring that may be. We need reinstatement in the very object of our lives, or if our sin or our blundering has made that impracticable, then the opportunity to realize some object of actual value. We have the right to believe, I repeat, that it is not in the plan of God that any man should be so "marred" in the making that if he may not become the man he might have been, or ought to have been, he

may not yet become a man after God's second uses. And many such there have been who have shown us how high and noble an end may thus be achieved.

In speaking to you about this recovery of personal power when it has been wasted or apparently lost, I may not speak to the immediate experience of any of you. But I think that I shall speak none the less a timely word, if in what I may say, I anticipate certain possible experiences and try to prepare you for them. It is a very great thing to have one's moral and spiritual life restored to him, quite as great as to experience the restoration of physical life. Indeed, as I have already intimated, it is quite conceivable that the second use of a man's life may far exceed the first use, as he may have understood it. The sainthood of not a few of the more virile saints dates from the recovery of personal power. Of course I am not considering now so indefinite, or what is relatively so inconsiderable a matter, as changes in our personal plans. This kind of change is going on continuously in our lives, and usually it involves no moral consequences. What I have in mind entirely is that kind of moral weakening through which we lose our grip on some first and really satisfying purpose, or that kind of immoral inconsistency through which we

may be obliged to abandon such a purpose. And what I would have you see clearly, and believe without a doubt, is the fact that there is room in the plan of God for every man who finds himself in any such condition, — room not only for the saving of himself, but for the saving of himself to his work.

But if we are to get the real meaning of this fact so as to be able to apply it in the time of need, we must start with the presumption that there is an intention, a purpose of God, in each of our lives. To presume this is only to accept in concrete form the saying of the philosophers that "God thinks in terms of life." Dr. Bushnell entitled one of his most positive and searching sermons, "Every Man's Life a Plan of God," — a thought which he expanded in the proposition "that God has a definite life-plan for every human person, girding him, visibly or invisibly, for some exact thing, which it will be the true significance and glory of his life to have accomplished." How do we know, you ask, that such is the fact, if it be a fact? And if we do not know the fact, and just what it means, of what use is it to us? Let us start, I answer, with the presumption that there is an intention or purpose of God in the lives of men, and see if that presumption does not fit the best interpretation we

can give to human life. The fact that a man cannot see the purpose of God in his life is no proof that it does not exist. We can see abundant reason why it should not appear. We should become at once and continuously involved in the tyranny of detail. We should lose out of our lives the joy of discovery. We should cease to be free workers. Not so does God enter into partnership with us. His sovereignty is adjusted to the fact that we are made in his image. Herein is the guarantee of our freedom, but herein also is the assurance that we have not been made in vain. If man is a purposeful creation, it is certainly consistent to believe that every man is capable of fulfilling a purpose. And so far as we can see, the whole scheme of the discipline of human life is based upon this idea. Moral truth we know is everywhere individualized. Take the commandments. The moral law was not given to man, but to men. "Thou shalt not" do this; "Thou shalt not" do that. I think that every time a man really hears one of the commandments it makes him feel his individuality. And all the more because of the negative way in which it is put. If I am made conscious of the power to do the thing which is forbidden, the power to lie, to steal, to kill, I am also made conscious of the power to do the very things which are most op-

posed to those which I must not do, the power to tell the truth, to give of my possessions to others, to save the lives of my fellow men. Only on this positive side of action there is immeasurable freedom and immeasurable range of activity. You can tell a man just what he cannot do: you cannot tell a man with equal plainness just what he can do. There is a hidden capacity for right doing which eludes all definition. God himself does not attempt to catalogue right actions. Here, I repeat, lies our freedom, but are we any the less sure because of this, of the presence within us and around us of "the power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness," or are we any the less sure that this "power" is intelligent, coöperative, and purposeful?

Or take again that marvelous interplay of incentive in human life which is so thoroughly individualized. It is impossible for one to do a conspicuously fine or noble deed without thereby speaking to his fellow men, as it were by name, in the way of incentive. True, a bad act if made attractive may be a temptation. But most bad acts at the time, and all bad acts in the end, however attractive they may have been, create revulsion. There is no revulsion from good acts. On the contrary, the good act, if it be touched with any of the finer qualities like courage or sacrifice,

communicates itself with an indescribable energy and influence to each one within its range. It seems to me that this organized interplay of influence of man upon man shows as clearly the intention of God in our individual lives, as do the commandments. Only here we have the positive, not the negative side. Has it never seemed to you, as you have felt the thrill of some noble act, or have found yourself in the presence of some ennobling soul, as if God were saying to you, "Look, that is what you can do, that is what you can be"? So does God continually remind us of ourselves, of the possibilities which lie within us, which He cannot fully define, but of which He can apprise us through the accomplished result in other men.

Or take yet again those more direct interferences and compulsions which make up so much of what we call the discipline of life. I have no doubt that more of us fail to realize God's intentions and purposes for us, through yielding to the hesitancies of our nature, than through disobedience, or the lack of responsiveness to quickening examples. Most of us are guilty of weariness in well doing. We stop short of the end which is clearly discernible and in every way to be desired. And so were it not for the compulsion or interference which seems at times so hard

to bear, many a man who really knows the purpose of his life, and feels the incentives which are urging him to reach it, would fail of the end because of this hesitancy, this halting by the way, this not infrequent turning back. Those of you who are familiar with the prose writings of the poet Moore may recall the story of the young Greek who sought to be initiated into the mysteries of the Egyptian religion. The process of initiation consisted in part of serious physical tests, among which was this: In an underground temple on the banks of the Nile, he was carried swiftly along an inclined plane, and, suddenly brought to a halt, was left alone, far down in the darkness. After a while there came a glimmer of light from above, and at the instant a stairway swung within his reach. He caught it and began to climb. When he had taken a step he heard a plash in the water below. The stair on which he had trodden was gone. As he took another step he heard another plash. Step by step the stairway fell apart. There was nothing for him to do but to climb. Have we not all seen men climbing just so? Who swung the stairway within their reach? Who made the backward step impossible? Who forced them up in the light? Let us never leave out of account the compulsions of God in our interpretation of the better lives of men.

Are we not warranted in the assumption, may I not call it a belief, that the first use of a man's life represents the thought, or intention, or plan of God, for him? But if this be a true assumption, justifying the emphasis which I put upon it, why are we not equally warranted, you may ask, in believing for the same reasons that a second or still further use of a man's life is also according to the purpose of God? Most assuredly we are warranted in so believing; this is the very assurance which I would have you take with all your heart, but I would not have you take it in the way of an easy inference. For between the first and any after use of a man's life something has always intervened which cannot be overlooked or passed by. Some moral lapse has befallen a man which leaves him in a degree another man, not only in the thought of God, but also in his own thought and feeling. That is why we are now talking about the recovery of personal power rather than about the continuous use of it. Something has gone away from a man, or gone out of him, which he is trying to get back, and which God is trying to help him to recover. And with the recovery, preceding it and attending it, there are experiences on our part, and efforts on the part of God, of which we must take account.

Let us look into this matter. How do we come

to lose personal power? How do we fall away from the first uses of our lives? Of course in answering these questions we must go below the object lesson before the prophet. The analogy fails at the point we are considering. A man is not simply clay in the hands of the potter. What is imperfection in the clay may be sin in the man. While the moral of the object-lesson holds good in spite of this difference, the difference is of immense concern as affecting the treatment of a human soul in the hands of God.

There are certain causes, to which I will briefly refer, which explain the moral lapses of men in respect to their uses, which in fact make the occasions for the recovery of personal power. Consider the effect upon a man's usefulness, the full use of himself, of the waste of time. You can hardly think of a spendthrift as a useful person. Suppose that in this sense one has "spent" twenty years of time. Did God plan his life with that waste in view? I do not charge to the account of these empty years dissipation or injustice. I simply let them stand empty. Can that amount of time be taken out of any man's life and he be left a useful man, according to any first use to which God could put him? And if this be not possible, is it fitting for a man to take up his life and try to go on with it, without a thought of

the squandered years, expecting that God will be equally thoughtless? Do you not see that even so common a matter as the waste of time must make a difference in a man's thought of himself, and in God's thought of him?

Or consider as clearly akin to the loss of personal power from the waste of time, that which comes in so frequently through the loss of the affirmative out of our lives. "Man's first word is yes, his second no, his third and last, yes." This was the saying of a very broad and keen observer of men. It would not be fair to say that this loss of the affirmative always represents distinctly a moral loss. And yet the fact remains that when the power of response has gone, or is suspended, there has gone with it the power of effective action. The joyous affirmative of youth may return to a man in the calm affirmative of age, but the dreary period of negation which often intervenes shows the man in his uselessness. The sphere of one's faith may be restricted, he may not believe many things, and his moral convictions may centre around a few objects; but some positive affirmation of moral and spiritual power there must be if one is to realize any supreme and commanding use of his nature. If for any reason the strength of one's manhood has been lost in negation, there may be a splendid recovery in the affirmative of

age, but this means a recovery of personal power, not its cumulative result.

Consider, again, the effect upon a man's usefulness, the right use of himself, of the spirit of compromise with evil. I suppose that there is nothing which weakens the consciousness of moral power so easily, or so certainly, as the spirit of compromise. I doubt if the overt act, which may be acknowledged and forgiven, produces so weakening an effect upon character. The spirit of compromise with evil is the spirit of cowardice. Nothing is more demoralizing to any of us than even the suspicion of the lack of moral courage. We thereby lose confidence in ourselves, and self-respect. Suppose, then, that the spirit of compromise has created a certain habit of business, or of social life, or even of opinion and belief, how can we have that estimation of ourselves which will enable us to fulfill any first use of our lives? And here again how can any of us hope to recover the sense of personal power thus lost, except through repentance on our part, and forgiveness on the part of God?

And yet again, consider the effect upon a man's usefulness, the available as well as the full and right use of himself, of the outside sin. By the outside sin I do not mean the open or exposed

sin. I mean the sin which lies as it were outside the sphere of his work. His work, it may be, calls especially for honesty, and the man is honest. He has never defrauded a fellow man. But he has his own vice, or, as we are wont to say, his own weakness, affecting him and not others, perhaps known only to himself. And yet this knowledge of it, except as it rouses in him a determined spirit of conflict, robs him of the sense of personal power. A known moral inconsistency, except, I repeat, as it rouses the soul to continuous battle, is fatal to any great usefulness. It is not easy to say just the right word at this point. I think that the man who has to fight the hardest to save himself may be the most helpful under certain circumstances to others. I think that the battle with any passion, whether of the body or of the mind, is an ennobling process. It may go on unceasingly in those who are fulfilling God's first uses for them. But if for any reason the battle has been given over, and the consciousness of sin has taken the place of the sense of conflict, then nothing remains but to set about the recovery of personal power through the selfsame way of repentance and forgiveness.

Now in what I have been saying as to the causes of those moral lapses in men which affect

their personal power and change the order if not the grade of their uses, I have not spoken of any of the gross or violent ways in which men dispossess themselves of their birthright. In other words, I have not had in mind the exceptional man with his exceptional sins, but the average man with his moral liabilities. "For all," as St. Paul says in his far-reaching words, "fall short of the glory of God." In this sense we all miss the mark of our high calling. But the distinction is clear, both to experience and to observation, between the man who through faith, and spiritual industry, and moral struggle maintains and develops his personal power, and the man who through the neglect of these saving qualities lets his personal power slip away from him. In the latter case there must be a process of recovery, and it is usually a twofold process, involving the recovery of the man to himself, and the recovery of the man to his uses. In this process God and the man himself work together, the man through repentance and faith, and God through forgiveness and help. It is a patient work. As Charles Kingsley wrote to Thomas Cooper, the Chartist, on his way to Christianity: "Be patient with God. Has He not had patience with you? And therefore have patience with all men and with all things, and then you will rise

again in due time the stouter for your long battle." If we have the right to presume that God has first uses for men which He would see accomplished in their lives, we have far more than any presumption to go upon in respect to the recovery of men to second uses. The simple, homely truth taught by the object lesson before us is the prelude to the teaching of the gospels. The recovery of men to themselves and to their uses, — this is Christianity. "I came not," said Jesus, "to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." "I say unto you that there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance." Christ is not here speaking in the language of definition, or dealing in proportions. He is trying to persuade the longing and yet reluctant heart of humanity to believe, not in the possibility, but in the certainty of God's concern, and of his delight in the work of recovery. The righteous man, like the elder son in the parable, may sometimes have his doubts and questionings about what God may think of him; but the sinner, like the prodigal, can have no doubt about what God thinks of him, or would do for him.

Let the assurance of this truth which lies at the heart of Christianity have its fit place in your working faith. Put it where you can reach it as

against some possible time of need. Accept it in all which it means and in all which it implies. Never rest content with the forgiveness of God when your "sins are covered," but go on to the recovery of personal power. Forgiveness is a means to an end, namely, the reinstatement of your life in its uses. If you have wasted time, redeem it. If your life has gone out into mere negation, let it close in some clear affirmation of truth. If you have compromised with evil, and men have known your habits, be not afraid or ashamed of the inconsistency of standing forth for righteousness. And if you have sinned to the conscious hurt of your soul, give your conscience, "purged of evil works" or of evil thoughts, the chance to approve of your now free and unhindered work for men and for God. As there can be no loss so great to any man as the loss of personal power, so there can be no recovery so great to any man as the recovery of personal power.

# THE MORAL TRAINING OF THE COLLEGE MAN

ADDRESSES AT THE OPENING OF SUCCESSIVE COLLEGE YEARS, 1905–1908

# I

## THE TRAINING OF THE GENTLEMAN

### ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE COLLEGE YEAR, 1905–1906

I WISH to speak to you, as you are now entering or returning to college, upon a somewhat unusual academic theme, namely, the Part which our Colleges must henceforth be expected to take in the Training of the Gentleman.

The presentation of this subject does not imply that our colleges have not heretofore trained gentlemen. That has been one of their assumed functions. Neither does it imply that men do not enter college as gentlemen.

I introduce this subject because of certain conditions which are beginning to manifest themselves within our colleges, which are making the training, or, if you please, the practice of a gentleman, more difficult. Men who enter the colleges are seen to be of three types, when measured by their ruling ambitions and tastes. We still have men possessed of the high passion for scholarship, whether that passion be expressed in the older delights of culture, or in the newer joy of research. I should not like to believe that

the mind of our American youth had ceased to respond at the very first chance, or continuously, to the great subject-matter of scholarship, — the experiences and the aspirations of men as recorded in the literatures of the world, or their reasonings as stimulated by scientific discovery. My faith in the survival of the passion of scholarship in the midst of the intellectual temptations of modern life is sustained by facts. The scholar still lives in our colleges. He is here, he is everywhere, though his tribe is small.

Of course the prevailing type of mind in the colleges is set towards affairs. It is well that it is so. If the exclusive or chief product of the colleges was the scholar, we should soon cease to have scholarship. We should have in its place pedantry. It is the intellectual competition from the world of affairs which keeps the modern scholar alive. The proportion of the scholar to the pedant was never so high as it is to-day.

An incoming type of the college man, seen in increasing numbers, represents in one form or another the social aspects of college life. The large increase of this class is due to two causes: first, to the long prosperity of the country which not only enables many more families than formerly to send their sons to college, but which also

awakens in them corresponding social ambitions; and second, to the greatly increased attractiveness of college life itself. The college man of this type is not necessarily aimless, but he is not usually possessed of the tastes of the scholar, or of the ambitions of the man of affairs. What he wants is college life, not college work. Now the organization of a part of college life around the idea of leisure rather than of work may seem to be helpful in the training of the gentleman. And so it is. The danger comes in, as I shall show you, when the right proportion in the allotment of time is violated, or when without any reference to time the whole interest in a man's thought and desire goes one way.

One condition then, which is comparatively new to American colleges, greatly affecting their office in the training of the gentleman, is the organization of leisure to the degree of very marked encroachment upon work. The other condition, also comparatively new, and affecting still more the work of training the gentleman, is the exposure of college life so completely to the methods and standards of the outer world set toward commercial success, a condition which needs no explanation until I come to apply it to our situation.

Let me now tell you with the utmost definite-

ness and frankness what I think that we must do to fulfill our part in the training of gentlemen. There are certain essentials in the making of a gentleman which underlie all the social conventionalities and give the reason for their existence. We must bear in mind that we have to do with men who are to declare the habit of their lives chiefly through their relation to the traditions and customs and social estimates of their own country. A gentleman is of course a gentleman the world around, but the conditions under which he is produced vary from nation to nation, as they vary from age to age.

The first essential which must be insisted upon by the colleges in the training of the gentleman is efficiency, not because it is the finest thing, but because it is fundamental. The social order with which you will have to do, and according to which you will be estimated, is organized around work rather than around leisure. This distinction, however, may be more apparent than real. The social order in many of the older countries which is marked by the absence of those compelling callings, which we call work, has its own duties and responsibilities which allow very little of actual leisure. The boy of rank is born into a well-ordered life. The routine of the household, so far as it affects him, is exacting. And when

he reaches the earliest approaches to maturity he is set at tasks, or placed in positions, which test him. An American family of fortune is more apt to produce untrained, if not uneducated, and irresponsible sons, than is an English family of rank. I take the liberty of reading an extract from a recent letter from Lord Dartmouth, which gives without the slightest intention a glimpse into the responsible activities of a well-trained English family. "It may be of interest to you to know," he says, "that my youngest son is now a Middy on H. M. S. King Edward VII, which helped to entertain the French Fleet at Brest; that my second son is on the point of starting for Central Africa, under the auspices of the British Museum, on a tour of collection and exploration; and that the oldest is the accepted candidate on the tariff reform platform, at the next general election for West Bromwich. He has made an excellent start, though it is very doubtful if he will be returned. The opposition in the constituency claim to be absolutely certain that he won't, but at any rate he will put up a good fight."

This is the record of three sons of an English house in their present training for some form of public service, the oldest not much beyond his majority. That there are idlers and profligates

among young men of rank is well understood, but they are very costly. The great houses cannot long sustain themselves except through virile and well-trained sons.

The whole trend of the better American life is against inefficiency. The shirk can never be rated among us as a gentleman. The colleges, therefore, of this country are expected to see to it that the men whom they turn out year by year satisfy the national demand, the social as well as the business demand, for efficiency. The chief way of meeting this demand must be through the spirit which obtains in our colleges, in which all who are concerned must have a part. The administration of a college must be in itself efficient, the teaching must be stimulating as well as accurate, and the public sentiment of the college must be intolerant of the shirk. But the spirit of the college must be measured by its standards, and these in turn must be maintained in part by its rules. Rules are for those who are relatively indifferent to the spirit of a college, probably at any given time not more than one fourth of its membership, but a very controlling part, if not held to the college standards.

In the enrollment for the present year it will appear that six men in the last Junior class fail to make Senior standing ; that twenty men in the

last Sophomore class fail to make Junior standing; and that twenty-one men in the last Freshman class fail to make Sophomore standing, — fifty men in all who cannot be advanced to their natural place. There are in some cases entirely sufficient and honorable reasons why men who are due to enter a succeeding class should not enter it, but the above result shows a disregard of one element of efficiency, namely, the doing of one's work in time. To arrest this tendency, a new rule will go into operation the present year to this effect: —

"The number of hours upon which the standing of a student for any semester shall be computed shall not be less than the minimum number of hours required for that semester."

Any student, that is, who sees fit to absent himself from a course which he thinks that he cannot make without too much effort will have his failure in that course charged to his account in his general average at the end of the semester. It will be seen that it is much better for one to have a partial failure, say of thirty or forty, reckoned into his average, than a total failure at zero, a rating which will affect particularly those who are on scholarships, or those whose general standing is insecure. I will also state that it is very doubtful if the Summer School will be open hereafter to

deficients, at least to those whose deficiencies are due to absences from recitations.

These announcements are made in the interest of those who endanger their own efficiency, and the efficiency of the college, through their postponement of work. The order of the modern world in which you will soon take your places does not recognize the gentleman of leisure, if by that term is meant the man who shirks a present and common duty to gratify a present and personal mood. To ask other men to wait upon his moods is more than a gentleman ought to ask. Respect for time is a necessary element in the training of the modern gentleman, because that involves in so large a degree the element of consideration for others.

But efficiency does not make a gentleman. There are a great many efficient men who are very far from being gentlemen. Judged by this test alone, there is no distinction between honorable and questionable successes. What may the efficient man lack among the essentials of a gentleman? He may lack honor. He has force, it may be in abundance. His power may be without quality. Power is refined by the sense of honor. How shall we define honor? Let us turn to that master of the higher ethics — Wordsworth.

"Say what is honor? 'T is the finest sense
Of justice which the human mind can frame,
Intent each lurking frailty to disclaim,
And guard the way of life from all offense, suffered or done."

Or let us take the statement of those whose art is that of careful discrimination, who say of honor that "it is the nice sense of what is right, just, and true, with course of life corresponding thereto: a strict conformity to the duty imposed by conscience, by position, or by privilege."

Honor then as you see is made up largely of personal sensitiveness. Poet and lexicographer are agreed in calling it a sense. It indicates not so much what a man thinks about a thing, as how he feels about it in all his nature. It can be defined only in personal terms. You can fix the standard of honesty, — above such a line a man is honest, below it he is dishonest. You cannot draw the line of generosity, above which a man acts nobly, below which he is mean. Much less can you fix the standard of honor. It is in the man himself. Hence the training toward honor is a training first toward sensitiveness to what is just, right, and true, and then a training of the will to enforce this finer sense in action.

Let us apply this principle to college life. The supreme test of honor is no longer to be found in what is known as the "honor system." For

various reasons the stress of temptation does not now fall upon honesty in examinations. The examination system has become really a part of the college curriculum. It has ceased, that is, to be an outside game between professor and student. Competition among scholars no longer leads one man to take unfair advantage of another. And college sentiment is steadily at work upon the individual student toward honesty. The increasing effect from class to class is very perceptible. By the time of graduation there is scarcely a man who would not scorn to cheat in examination. The penalty at this point, which is capital punishment, must remain till every vestige of dishonesty is removed; but there has been a steady and rapid decline in this form of college dishonor.

For the most practical tests of honor we must turn from college work to college sport. The law of temptation, gentlemen, is very simple. Temptation follows the life. Wherever the life centres, there temptation does its strongest work. Now college life is at present more intense, more congested, more subject to the irresponsibilities of excitement, on the field of sport than anywhere else. And this holds true not merely during the progress of a game, but at every point in those organized activities which represent competitive athletics. I do not propose to enumerate the

various points in these organized activities at which college honor is liable to suffer, partly because I do not wish to give a disproportionate place to this phase of my subject, but chiefly because I believe that the organization of athletics has tended more and more to the purification of athletics. Through the persistent work of athletic committees, and of many captains and managers, and of many coaches, a great many dishonorable practices and methods have been organized out of the system. In fact so much has been accomplished through organization, and through the publicity attending organized methods, that it has now become possible to take the appeal in behalf of college honor in sport distinctly to two parties which have not heretofore been sufficiently in evidence. It has now become possible to appeal as never before to the second thought of the whole student body of a college. Heretofore, a college has virtually said to the athlete, "You win the game, we will do the rest." But the intelligent men of a college no longer stake their interest on the fortune of a game. They wait the verdict of the season. That verdict is the verdict of experts, which takes less and less account of mere victories and more and more account of those athletic values in men and in teams which represent honest training and honest work.

And it has now become possible to take the appeal more directly to the honor of the athlete himself. There is the place where in the last resort it must fall — upon his sense of honor. It is right to demand and to expect the growth of honor in the college athlete. You recall one of the more practical definitions of honor which I quoted, — "conformity, in conduct to one's position or privilege."

The college athlete has reached an exacting position or privilege, more exacting than he is probably aware of. He has become, in college sentiment and in that outside sentiment which a college controls, the representative college man. He has for the time being displaced the scholar, the debater, and all other traditional representatives. Such a position must be to him its own sufficient reward, else he will forfeit his right to it. The moment that a college athlete asks for other rewards than high honor from his fellows, that moment he ceases to be worthy of their honor.

The whole argument against the denial of the right of the college athlete to outside earnings because of its assumed discrimination against poor men, has always seemed to me utterly irrelevant. Any man is at liberty to earn money through his athletic abilities. It is an entirely honorable way

of earning money. But when a man becomes a college athlete he makes his choice between honor and money as his reward, and if he chooses honor, his own sense of honor ought to hold him to his choice.

I have been speaking of college life as reaching its greatest intensity in athletics. But side by side with this intensity, there is to be noted a diffusion of college life over many and various interests which exposes it to the ordinary temptations of the outer world. A college does so much business, that the men who carry it on are constantly exposed to what are falsely termed "business methods." They have the opportunity, and are often solicited to make private gain out of the occasions for rendering public service to organizations, classes, or the college. Personal initiative, enterprise, management have their proper rewards in college as elsewhere. There are services which ought to be paid for. It is not improper to seek openly positions which allow these services, provided one is competent to fill them. But in all such cases there should be the strictest regard to accurate and responsible expenditures of money. I urge upon every class the necessity of a careful record of all its business meetings. Make the class secretaryship the most responsible position in the class, both in college and afterwards. And

in all organizations, which represent private enterprise, but which have to do with the college name or the college reputation, see to it that there is a clear rendering of accounts to all parties concerned. I deplore the slightest tendency on the part of college men to utilize public service for private gain. The most despicable word which has crept into current speech is the word "graft." Let it not be so much as named in the college world. If a man's honor is not quick at this point, his college has everything to fear from him, and nothing to hope for from him in the future.

The efficient man, if he be possessed of honor, must be essentially a gentleman. Of that there can be no doubt. But I think that the term allows something more. Honor does not quite express that unselfishness of character and of action which we like to ascribe to a gentleman. I should add, therefore, to efficiency and honor, devotion, that outgoing and saving force which is needed to satisfy our conception of a gentleman in the full capacity of his life or in its most generous action. Honor is not a negative force, far from it. But it is largely a restraining force. It keeps one back from injustice, untruth, and wrongdoing toward others. And it may be a quick and mighty incentive to brave and generous action. But honor has never been quite a sufficient power, as we

measure the great, saving powers of the world. It gave us the many gains of the age of chivalry, but it did not fight the battles of modern freedom, nor found the modern state or church. It gave us the crusader, but not the missionary. We somehow feel that we must have the man to-day, and surely he ought to be a gentleman, who can teach us how to rule our cities, how to control and guide our corporate wealth, how to rescue society from its hard and selfish weariness. And in so far as we have men of this type in society, in control of corporate power, ruling over cities, at the head of the nation, we feel that we have in them more than efficiency, more than honor. We are conscious of a devotion on their part, inspiring in its unselfishness, which we should not wish to leave out of our ideal of manhood. Our gentleman cannot be an insufficient man, and selfishness is the great insufficiency.

In this talk about the part which the college may take in the training of a gentleman, I have not dwelt, as you have noticed, upon forms or conventionalities. Every gentleman respects form. Respect for form can be taught or at least inculcated, but not form itself. One comes to be at ease in society by going into society. Manners come by observation. We imitate, we follow the better fashion of society, the better behavior of

men. Good breeding consists first in the attention of others in our behalf to certain necessary details, then in our attention to them. We come in time to draw close and nice distinctions. This little thing is right, that is not quite right. So we grow into the formal habits of a gentleman. "Good manners are made up of constant and petty sacrifices," says Emerson. It is well to keep this saying in mind as a qualification of another of his more familiar sayings: "Give me a thought, and my hands and legs and voice and face will all go right. It is only when mind and character slumber that the dress can be seen."

I like to see the well-bred man, to whom the details of social life have become a second nature. I like also to see the play of that first healthy instinct in a true man which scorns a mean act, which will not allow him to take part in the making of a mean custom, which for example, if he be a college fellow, will not suffer him to treat another fellow as a fag. I am entirely sure that that man is a gentleman.

So then it is, in this world of books, of companionship, of sport, of struggle with some of us, of temptation also, and yet more of high incentives, we are all set to the task of coming out, and of helping one another to come out, as gentlemen. Do not miss, I beseech you, the great-

ness of the task. Do not miss its constancy. It is more than the incidental work of a college to train the efficient, the honorable, the unselfish man. A college-bred man must be able to show at all times and on all occasions the quality of his distinction.

## II

### THE TRAINING OF THE SCHOLAR

ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE COLLEGE YEAR, 1906–1907

As we came together last year I discussed the social aspect of college life, emphasizing the part which our colleges and universities are expected to take in the training of the gentleman. Running through all routine and technical work of an academic sort there are certain clear purposes which issue in personal results, the outcome of which can be expressed only in personal terms. The college man must be imbued with the spirit of the gentleman, he must be imbued with the spirit of scholarship, and he must be imbued with the spirit of citizenship. The claim of manners to a commanding place in the college world is as old as any academic foundation. The claim of citizenship is more modern, but it is steadily growing clearer and more exacting. The claim of scholarship inheres in the original and abiding intention of the college. Not that our colleges may be expected to produce scholars in the same proportion and to the same degree in which they may be expected to produce gentlemen and citizens, but cer-

tainly it is a reasonable expectation that every college man is capable of being imbued to a certain extent with the spirit of scholarship. Otherwise a man is out of place in college. It is no advantage, as it is no credit to him, to be there.

I ask, therefore, — it is the point of departure for my address, — Are the colleges of to-day sufficiently honoring the claims of scholarship? I ask this question as applicable equally to faculties and students.

It is applicable to faculties because we usually get from our students what we persistently ask for, provide for, and expect. The administrative policies which characterize the modern college are apparently contradictory in their effect upon scholarship. On the one hand, the college has been opened to competing objects of ambition. Other standards of excellence than those determined by scholarship have been introduced and acknowledged. A generation ago a student could hardly satisfy his ambition except through rank in his class. To-day he finds satisfaction in excellence in athletics, or through the acquirement of leadership in some one of the various activities of college life. The principle of competition is at work more effectively without the class-room than within.

On the other hand, the adoption of the elective system has been a stimulus to individual scholarship. It has made study more interesting. It has enabled a great many men to find themselves. It has introduced the element of individuality into college work.

The modern college, then, is at a disadvantage in the matter of scholarship, when compared with its predecessor, in the fact that the principle of competition has been allowed to take effect elsewhere than in scholarship; it has the advantage over its predecessor, in the matter of scholarship, in the fact that it places before students for personal choice a wider, more varied, and more interesting curriculum.

Just how these two tendencies balance in any given case it is impossible to say, but I think that a third tendency has come in, quite unnoticed, which operates against scholarship in our colleges, namely, the tendency to allow the absorption of the idea of scholarship by the graduate school.

The result has been that the idea of work has been substituted for that of scholarship in our colleges. Scholarship, meaning thereby the idea of genuine, interested, protracted study, has been postponed to the professional school. The scholar has become in our thinking a professional, just as much as a lawyer or a physician. We have ceased

to expect scholarship until the circumstance allows the professionalized student, and have accepted in place of scholarship various gradations of work. I think that our colleges are suffering to-day from the want of respect, on the part of faculties, for amateur scholarship. I have referred to the gradations of work. The ranking system with us, as you know, divides men into classes according to the decimals between 50 and 100: A 90–100, B 80–90, C 70–80, D 60–70, E 50–60.

This comparatively wide range of marking has been adopted because, in the language of one of the older members of the faculty, fifty points is none too much to express the difference between the maximum and minimum working of minds, the lowest of which is entitled to college recognition. But I have often thought that the formal result of this system is to increase the number on the lower ranges and to diminish the number on the higher range. This is on the assumption that marking is relative rather than absolute.

However this may be, about 54 per cent of the College during the first semester of last year was on the three upper grades and 46 per cent on the two lower grades, though 16 per cent only was on the lowest grade. Classes vary in scholarship, but the rule is that scholarship, as judged by the ranking systems, advances rapidly in junior and senior

years. Thus in the record of the last year referred to, 12 per cent of the Senior class ranked A, 22 per cent B, 35 per cent C, 21 per cent D, and 10 per cent E.

It is evident that only the lowest grade represents what may be termed enforced scholarship. It is this grade which is the chief concern, so far as discipline is a matter of scholarship, of the committee on administration. Above this grade everything depends upon the spirit of scholarship. And for the development of this spirit a faculty has three means of influence: first, the proper adjustment of college activities — including college sports — to college work; second, the arrangement of the curriculum and of individual courses with the view to the greatest intellectual stimulus; and third, personal inspiration, of which the chief factor at present consists, as I believe, in the belief and expectation that the scholar can live and grow in the atmosphere of the college. The spirit of scholarship is not the spirit of celibacy, though the scholar committed to a given task may work to best advantage in the detached life of the graduate school.

Turning now to the attitude of undergraduate students toward the question before us, we naturally find a corresponding disposition to restrict the sphere of scholarship. The scholar, according

to college sentiment, may be the man of brilliant parts, the man distinctly of mind; but he is for the most part reckoned as the unsocial man, the man most out of sympathy with the temper of college life and activities. Of the actual men whom you may designate as scholars I can have nothing to say, but in what I may further say to you I want to try to change your interpretation of the spirit of scholarship. For, if it is rightly understood, I believe that all college men will have the sense to appreciate it at its true value, and that many who are now indifferent to its claims will have the sense to avail themselves of its incentives.

The greatest thing which can be said, and which is always to be said, about the spirit of scholarship is that it inculcates and develops the love of truth. This is peculiarly the significance of modern scholarship. The scholarship of to-day is not measured by the amount of one's learning but by the truthfulness of his knowledge. We are living under the aphorism of one of our late humorists, — "It is better not to know so much, than to know so many things that are not so." The first process in scholarship is to divest accredited knowledge of all assumptions, and uncertainties, and unrealities of any kind. So that if the process stops at this point it has created in

the scholar a habit of mind of immense value. If you enter any of the professions with this habit of mind, law, medicine, teaching, the ministry, or any one of the great businesses, you cannot allow any sham, or sophistry, or other kind of untruth, without a sharp mental protest. You tolerate any of these things at a mental cost which the untrained mind does not have to pay. This is the negative work of the spirit of scholarship. On the positive side it opens new fields of vision, a vast territory of thought and of action otherwise inaccessible. The truth-loving mind is more apt to be endowed with insight, invention, and initiative, than any other kind of mind. When once it enters upon its stimulating and exhilarating action it reacts upon the whole nature. I have seen men in college over and over again caught by the spirit of investigation in one of the natural or physical sciences, and thereby diverted if not converted from wasteful and demoralizing habits already formed. And as I have followed these particular men into their after work in no case have I seen a moral relapse. The spirit of scholarship is in its highest intent the spirit of truth, and therefore shares in degree the great prerogative of truth, — "The truth shall make you free."

After we have said that the spirit of scholar-

ship develops the love of truth, we may say that it is largely concerned with the training for power. The powerful men of to-day are of two types, men of will, and men of trained minds. Neither type is complete in itself. Will-power unrelieved, or in excess, gives the overreaching or otherwise blundering man. Mental power unsupported often lacks initiative or endurance. But the trained mind represents, on the whole, better than any other one thing, the present standard of power. It is, after all, the scholar in the broad sense of the term, the man who has learned how to investigate, to analyze, to reason, to invent, to anticipate, who is most in demand in the business world. A good address, activity, industry will carry a man pretty well along on the road to success, but if these be all, there comes a place at which he stops, and men of the training I have described go by him. I am not saying that some very indifferent scholars in college may not become successful in business or in the professions. What I am saying is that if they are genuinely successful, it is usually through having afterwards learned to use their minds in practically the same way in which they might have learned to use them while in college. The tasks are different, the problems are different, but the kind of mind called for is the same. Success of the highest sort in business means

scholarship in business. There are no substitutes for it. The man who shirks it simply condemns himself to those grades where men are striving together in that kind of physical activity which the street calls "hustling."

I carry my thought a little farther, and still more into the region of personal results, when I say to you that the spirit of scholarship is becoming more and more necessary for teaching men how to gratify their tastes properly through the use of money. If there is any class of students who for personal reasons ought to acquire the spirit of scholarship it is those who propose to make money. You who propose to do this, if you succeed, will be met after a little by the question, How will you spend it? The question does not now seem to you to be of very serious account. It may prove to be the most serious question of a personal sort which you will have to answer. The most lamentable sight now before us is that of the great multitude of persons of easy wealth, who do not care to use their money for others, and who do not know how to spend it rationally on themselves. Most of the money which is now being spent in personal ways goes for show or for amusement. The spectacle has ceased to be attractive. I think that the stronger and clearer minded young men of the country are beginning

to turn away from it. But if you had the money of these persons whom you no longer envy, and their tastes, what would you, or what could you, better do with the money? Do you not see that the question is really a question of desires and tastes? Do you not see how helpless a man is who is rich in money, but poor in imagination and taste?

To the man, therefore, who proposes to make money, assuming that for one reason or another this is the motive underlying the transition from the old professions to business, the question as to how he shall spend so much of it as he can rightly spend upon himself or his family is of supreme importance. It must be anticipated. It cannot be satisfactorily answered through the mental powers and habits which have been used in the making of money. The right, or fit, or enjoyable spending of money calls for entirely different qualities from those required for gaining it. The college man who has trained himself to become a great earning force, but who has not trained those powers which at the proper time will teach him how to spend his earnings, is simply preparing himself for the fate of those whom he now sees and pities.

I enjoin most earnestly upon all of you who propose for yourselves a business career that you

acquire now and at any cost the spirit of scholarship, for two reasons, — first, because your time for study is limited when compared with the time of those who go over into professional studies; and secondly, because you will have in all probability the means of gratifying those tastes which the spirit of scholarship can create. Some of you will have access to the world of beauty in nature and in art. Some of you will be able to possess, not merely to own, but to possess the things which men value according to their intelligence and taste. Some of you will have the opportunity to use wealth for personal culture as well as for personal enjoyment.

Will you ignore these opportunities because you are not prepared to take them, and therefore give your time, your money, yourselves, to restless activities or cheap amusements? Or will you take these opportunities because you have prepared yourselves to take them through the training of your finer senses? The question, as it now confronts you, is really a question of scholarship. The spirit of scholarship becomes, when so directed, the spirit of the finer sensibilities and tastes. It is the spirit of discrimination. It teaches the difference between the coarse and the fine, just as it teaches the difference between the true and the false.

I do not claim that the spirit of scholarship is the deepest thing which appeals to our better nature, — there is a stronger and a deeper call which leads us straight to service and to sacrifice. Of that I can speak more fitly at other times. To-day I set forth the claims of the spirit of scholarship and its appeal to you. I want to make the perspective of college life clear to you, to some of you at the start, to some of you who have not yet really found it, or are not yet ordering your lives according to it. Do not mistake the incidents of college life for the substance of it. The incidents are full of color. They show for more than the plain substance. But not one, nor all of them would have given us this college, or any college. Colleges are established and endowed and administered to give to each incoming generation access to the mind of the world. Incidentally they stand for free and generous companionship, for healthful activities, for honorable sport. But the end of it all, near at hand and far beyond, is the knowledge and valuation of those things which have made out of this world "the habitable earth," the fitting home for the sons of men. What are these things? Truth, and again truth, and power, and beauty. In these things, and in the still deeper joy of service and sacrifice, lies the desirable and attainable good of the

world. Do not let the pleasures of the way detain you too much, nor divert you too far, so that you fail to reach the acknowledged and chosen end for which you have set your feet in this ancient pathway.

## III

## THE TRAINING OF THE CITIZEN

### ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE COLLEGE YEAR, 1907–1908

In the opening address of this year I continue the course of thought which I began two years ago, designed to emphasize the distinctive objects of college training. At that time I discussed the more personal bearing of college training, especially through its social influences, calling your attention to the increasing obligation, as it seemed to me, of our colleges to train men to become gentlemen. Last year I discussed the question — Are the colleges of to-day sufficiently honoring the claims of pure scholarship? I am now to speak of the relation of the American college to citizenship. I may add that it had been in my thought to conclude this series by the consideration of the question — Are our colleges now producing under other forms the equivalent of that altruism, which, at the origin of the older colleges, found its immediate and most vivid expression in religious consecration?

These four objects are, as I conceive, the objects for which our colleges and universities exist,

— personal culture, scholarship set toward truth, some superior qualifications for citizenship, and the spirit of altruism in some compelling form. The first aim, personal culture, is our inheritance from the English colleges. The second, scholarship in the modern sense, is an importation from the German university. The third, some superior qualifications for citizenship, is from the necessity of our national life more distinctively American. The divorce of scholarship from politics is at once the strength and the weakness of the German university. The English colleges have furnished in large measure the statesmen of England and the rulers of India, but chiefly because of that restricted type of leadership characteristic of a democracy led by an aristocracy. The American college stands committed, alike through its freedom of investigation and discussion, and through its early consecration to state and church, to the production of the superior qualifications for citizenship. This obligation to the state has always found a place among the best traditions of our historic colleges. What is relatively new is our gradual recognition and understanding of the fact, that in a pure democracy like our own there can be no progress and no security, unless everything within it which has productive power for good is disposed and prepared to contribute to

the public good according to its capacity and according to the relative value of its product.

I must be brief in the discussion of this subject, but, before I say more upon it, I wish to recall each of the two preceding subjects for a word of renewed application.

The personal culture which marks the gentleman is based on self-control. The greatest test of self-control in college life is found, as things are to-day, in connection with college sports. Are we gaining in our ability to meet this test? To put the question bluntly, Can college men be counted upon to play without getting mad? Can our colleges carry on intercollegiate contests without being obliged, from time to time, to suspend relations with one another? I do not recall an instance in the long rivalry between Oxford and Cambridge when it has been found necessary to suspend relations. It is relatively quite immaterial that we should spend time in improving the game, if we cannot, as we go on, improve the temper, the behavior, the spirit of fair play on the part of players and of their supporters.

Still further and to the same point, are we holding our gains in the interest of amateur as opposed to professional athletics? Apparently the temptations to evasion, or deception, or to open

surrender to commercialism, in connection with baseball are too strong to be resisted. The academic player has not been able to maintain his separateness, his distinctness from the professional player. More demoralization, in my judgment, has come into college life from the commercial seductions of baseball, than from all the liabilities of any sort inherent in or associated with football, the really great and genuine academic game. If this demoralization continues, I am prepared, as a lover and defender of college athletics, to advise the elimination of baseball, as an intercollegiate game, from college sports. I would confine academic games to games which have no outside market value, unless we can make the price we pay, and which we do pay most liberally, a sufficient reward, — namely, college honor.

Recalling in like manner the subject of scholarship, I ask, Are we gaining in the spirit of scholarship? The results of enforced scholarship show, I think, a commendable gain. Through the careful certification of schools as well as of students, through the consistent advance in the requirements for admission, through the refusal to admit special students, and more recently through the abolition of the makeup system and the second examination, the faculty has changed

very perceptibly the lower grades of scholarship. We have also gained somewhat in the results of stimulated scholarship, through the wiser use of the elective system, through the more suggestive and inviting arrangement of the curriculum, through the better adjustment of suitable courses to professional aims and methods, and especially through the growing freedom of intercourse between students and instructors. What we still lack in too large a degree is the free, courageous, exuberant spirit of scholarship. I should not like to believe, I do not believe, that half the men who go to college here and elsewhere are not capable of realizing the joy of the intellectual life. But I should not be willing to affirm that half the men in any college in this country do realize that joy. The scholar will come to his own in college sentiment when he shows the same zest and enthusiasm which the born athlete shows for the game, provided he shows himself equally human, able to make full and ready contact with his fellows.

Returning to the subject immediately before us, I take up the third object of college training, training for citizenship. The college man, as I have said, ought to be the man of superior qualifications for citizenship. What are the superior qualifications for citizenship? I name first without hesitation, because always important but now

necessary, the willingness to subordinate private interest to the public good. Why should I speak of anything which has become a necessity as a superior qualification? Because it is so rare. For generations the people of this country have been so rooted and grounded in individualism that almost instinctively a man's first thought of himself, in relation to the state, is as an individual, and then, if at all, as a citizen. In consequence, as the opportunity has presented itself in so many tempting forms, men have not hesitated, some thoughtlessly, others by all inventions and devices, to plunder the state, or the people through the state. We have become familiar with the process, —the inflated tariff, the improper franchise, the special and often corrupt legislation, anything to convert public utilities into private gain. It is often charged by the supporters of a given monopoly that any attack upon the system tends to suppress private enterprise. No sane man has any contention with private enterprise except as it makes its gains at the public expense. It is the utter indifference of so many persons of power to the responsibility of citizenship which is awakening the surprise and fear of careful observers at home and abroad. Foreign observers are discussing the effect upon the life of the nation from this decline in patriotism. One of the most recent of them

has written this ominous word — "America, the model of nations, on the downward path." It is not necessary for us to accept this judgment or even to sympathize with it, but we cannot learn too early or too eagerly how to associate patriotism with the subordination of private interest to the public good. This is every-day patriotism, the only kind which avails a nation in the long years. I therefore say to you that unless you are willing to plan your lives to meet the demand of this kind of patriotism, and to so plan them that you will be able to resist very great temptations, you will graduate without any claim whatever to this superior qualification for citizenship.

A second superior qualification for citizenship lies in the ability to aid in the formation of public opinion. Public opinion is not the haphazard opinion of the many. It is made up in large degree of that moral sentiment which usually permeates the masses, but it can never accomplish even moral ends without an intelligent and well-defined purpose. No man can expect to contribute much to public opinion who is destitute of genuine moral sympathies; neither can one contribute much who cannot help to interpret, to inform, to vitalize public sentiment. True, there are times when wise men hold their peace and leave the field to experts. The contrast between the issues which centred in

slavery and those which centre in the currency, or the tariff, or taxation, or any strictly economic question, is very marked. But soon or late every public question broadens into the wider ranges of discussion. Any one can see the broadening process which is now going on from the economic into the political. Just over and beyond the question of trusts, and tariffs, and transportation, there is emerging the far greater question of governmental authority, the supreme question of sovereignty, — where does it reside, how is it to be distributed, how enforced? Such questions as these inhere in the political responsibilities of citizenship. They cannot be "let out" to experts. In time they lead every man to the ballot box.

It is partly in anticipation of the return of these fundamental political issues that the department of Political Science has been enlarged and strengthened. Certainly every college man should have the opportunity for some clear understanding of the prerogatives of government and of its limitations, with a view to informing and advising his fellow citizens, as the proper occasion may arise, as well as for his own action.

This particular illustration is but one showing the present opportunity for the exercise of some superior qualification for citizenship. In the matter of forming public opinion the press may be

supposed to cover the field. Indirectly the press does cover the field. It gives us for the most part the facts on which we form our opinions on public questions. But directly its influence might be greater. We ought to have more organs of reflective opinion. I marvel at the sanity, and accuracy, and insight with which some of the editorial writers on our dailies judge the passing issue. Probably something would be lost in their case if you should attempt to change this practice of ready judgment. But the average daily has become, through the enterprise of the trade or through public demand, so largely a newspaper, that I believe we are now ready, in much larger numbers, for the weekly organ of editorial opinion and criticism, assuming, of course, that the man who takes more time to think will not think himself away into cynicism, or pessimism, or some other dehumanizing "ism."

A third superior qualification for citizenship consists in the fixed purpose, which should acquire the force of a habit, to relate one's work, one's business or profession, to the public welfare. We have already carried the idea of patriotism beyond the sacrifices incident to war. We are growing familiar with the extension of the idea to the discharge of all civic duties of an official sort. Governor Hughes has given impressive utterance to

this enlarged view in the sentiment that the flag which floats over the offices of the government declares the same obligation with that which floats over the field of battle. Gradually the idea is being extended further still. Dr. Ray Lankester, president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in a recent address protests against the restriction of the idea of patriotism to the work of soldiers, statesmen, rulers, or any so-called public men, affirming that it covers equally the work of the more advanced scientists; and he calls upon the universities of England to recognize this fact in their training. The sanitary work of science has gained popular recognition, as in the physical reconstruction of Panama, and in the treatment of the sleeping sickness in Africa, results of national significance. Many more captains of industry might be recognized as patriots if they were willing to rule out questionable methods of success, or to hold purely commercial rewards in abeyance. Why should not the process go on? Why should not every man's work be related, consciously related, to the public welfare? Popular recognition of the idea will follow, it cannot precede the fact.

You ask me if a man should choose his business or profession with reference to its capacity for public service. I answer, yes, this is an hon-

orable ground of choice. But under present conditions I think that it is equally, if not more, honorable to compel the business or profession which one may have chosen from personal fitness, to render just service to the community or nation. Just now the demand of patriotism is for the enforcement of moral obligation upon, or the infusion of moral life into, some unwilling businesses and some reluctant professions.

The last superior qualification for citizenship, which I name, may be found in the very honorable ambition to serve the state in the way of official duty. This may or may not involve seeking for an office. A man who is actuated by an honorable purpose ought not to be scared by popular terms of reproach. One man may honorably seek the office which another man may as honorably decline or even despise. But my suggestion at this point does involve a political career, a career which I have no hesitancy in urging upon some of you; for in my judgment nothing short of a political career will allow you to accomplish much politically. Politics is too intricate and serious and continuous a business to be taken up and put by at will, or at the suggestion of one's friends, or even on the demand of a community. Politics is not really a business at all, but an "estate" after the language of the

Prayer Book, and as such "not to be entered into unadvisedly or lightly," nor, as must be added, temporarily. The chief reason why so many political reforms never come to a conclusion is that those who oppose them know perfectly well that those who urge them are not in politics to stay. They have only to wait, in the majority of cases, for things to resume their natural way, which is also their way. When the political reformer really camps upon the enemy's ground, he is quite sure to win the field, that particular field; but then, what next? Where has the enemy gone and what is he doing?

In American politics there is one foe to a career, more deadly in some localities than in others, but almost everywhere a curse to political life, namely, rotation in office. I do not refer to the spoils system, which has been so greatly curbed by the civil service, but to that foolish habit of mind on the part of the American people which considers office-holding as an honor to be passed around. A man of some dignity, or wealth, or influence wants to be mayor or governor for the distinction. Why should he not have a chance? And as a good many men want the position for the same reason, why should not the time of service be reduced to the minimum so that as many as possible may have the distinc-

tion? What plans can be carried out, what policy established, what progress made under such an arrangement, compared with the results which might be expected under more permanent service? Especially is the loss by this policy most seriously felt in municipal government, where the contrast with the government of European cities is so often taken to our discredit. The latest criticism which I have chanced to see is from Rear Admiral Chadwick: —

"After such study as I have been able to give the subject, I have become convinced that the main cause of our failure is in placing city administration in the hands of haphazard short-term men. A change to a greater permanency of office is our primal need. This necessity is everywhere else recognized. In England we find the actual administration wholly in the hands of technical experts.

"But it is Germany which recognizes in the greatest degree the business aspect of municipal administration. The Mayor in Germany is a Mayor by profession, a highly trained and experienced city administrator. He may be called, if he acquires a reputation, from city to city."

This criticism overlooks certain methods to which we are bound politically, but I believe that the main point of the criticism is right.

In spite, however, of some outward conditions I am confident that the present times are favorable to the choice of a political career. From first to last a man seeking such a career must be honest, intelligent, courageous, and manifestly unselfish. Given these qualities, there is room as well as a demand for college men. The motives of such a career are upon you in common with men from other colleges. Perhaps the traditions of this college are especially urgent. I have had occasion to say to you elsewhere that from the beginning of the national life Dartmouth has always had representation in one or both houses of Congress, more frequently in both, as well as in other governmental positions. And its representatives have been influential. The late Commissioner of Education, Dr. Harris, remarked that his observation of men in Washington had led him to consider that the characteristic of public men from this college was directive force. I had not thought of this characteristic as worthy of special notice in the history of the government, but upon reflection, I recalled such illustrations as Senator Proctor's speech forcing the issue on the freedom of Cuba, Mr. Dingley's persistent development of the tariff which bears his name, Thaddeus Stevens's policy of reconstruction, Salmon P. Chase's financial conduct of the Civil

War, and Mr. Webster's permanent establishment of the principle of nationality. Opinions may vary as to the wisdom of some of these efforts and the value of their results, but the fact of directive force is clear. This force held in honor in our traditions may be perpetuated in many ways. A political career offers a permanent and, as I think, a most timely opportunity for its exercise.

I express the hope that the mind of this College will always be hospitable to the claims of citizenship. I express the hope that your minds may be open to these claims here and now. The state cannot exist free, safe, and abiding without the devotion and sacrifice of the best. You have no right to expect to live in freedom and safety upon the devotion and sacrifices of other men. Whatever you may accomplish, or may fail to accomplish in the furtherance of your personal aims and ambitions, may you know in the final reckoning with yourselves, that you have given something of your best thought and purpose to the advancement and perpetuity of the nation.

# IV

## THE TRAINING OF THE ALTRUIST

### ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE COLLEGE YEAR, 1908–1909

I WELCOME you again, Gentlemen, to your place in the honorable succession of college students. Year by year, with the natural increase of students, the question inevitably arises, Is there a corresponding increase in the intellectual and moral valuation of the College? To those of us who watch as well as direct this annual process of production, the growing concern is for the quality of the product. Whether the number of those seeking the higher education throughout the country is, or is not, rightly proportioned to the whole population, it is evidently sufficient to give prominence to other questions than that of numbers. What are the motives, the purposes, the determinations of those entering our colleges and universities? As respects yourselves, how much intellectual and moral enthusiasm, how much will power, have you brought with you as you enter or return to the college? What capacity can you show for quickening and enlargement, what disposition to resist the easy, the unworthy, the

commonplace, what resoluteness of desire to advance, and in due time to achieve? These are the questions which concern you, man by man, and which concern us all in regard to you, not chiefly how many of you are here, but being here, what personal values are you capable of taking on?

The opening addresses of the past years have been set to the one purpose of clarifying the outlook on college life. A man can go through college without really seeing the things which are best worth seeing, some of the very things indeed which he thought and expected to find there. I have been anxious that no man among you should go through college blindly, or with dim and confused vision, but clearly, having always in sight the realities. To go back no further than the year when those of you who are seniors entered college, I endeavored to show how much was involved in the social influences of college life, which were all the while making a man more or less of a gentleman, according to his understanding and use of them. The year following I discussed the present claims of scholarship upon undergraduates, showing you what it meant for a college man not to be a scholar at least in spirit and intention. And last year I took up the very vital relation of a college training to the new demands of citizenship.

In the address of this year I go farther and deeper in my thought, for I am to pass into the region of motives. The legitimate and appropriate outcome of a college course is personal power. What are to be your motives in the accumulation of this kind of power? Some of you may recall that as I announced the subject of the last year I then remarked that it had been in my thought to conclude this series of discussions with the consideration of the question, Are our colleges now producing under other forms the equivalent of that altruism, which, at the origin of the older colleges, found its immediate and most vivid expression in religious consecration? The opportunity of again addressing you, which I did not then anticipate, having returned to me, I make use of it to carry out my original intention. Of the four essential objects of college training, to train the gentleman, to train the scholar, to train the citizen (objects already considered), there remains for our consideration the highest task of the college, namely, that of trying to bring every man within its influence under the spirit of altruism in some one of its compelling forms.

As I pass to this last object of college training, I recall each of the preceding objects for a word of comment suggested by the experience of the year, or by the present circumstance.

In speaking of the training which produces the gentleman I referred particularly to the opportunity for its exercise on the field of sport. I now wish to congratulate you upon the way in which during the last year the college in a collective sense played the gentleman. In your action in regard to summer baseball you took what you regarded as the position of honor at the risk of defeat. The fact that your action brought you success does not detract from the honor due to you, and in this honor none are more deserving of recognition than those who generously acted with you to their own disadvantage. This college has not seen a finer example of undergraduate loyalty than was shown by the men who gave their influence and active support to the teams from which they had been debarred.

Since urging upon you the special claims of scholarship, I have noted a very stimulating suggestion from John Morley (he will be to us for a long time John Morley, not Lord Morley), as to the inciting cause of scholarship. "The general principles of a study," he said by way of quotation, in an address at the University of Manchester, "you may learn by books at home — the detail, the color, the tone which make it live in us all, these you catch from those in whom it already lives." Scholarship, that is, Gentlemen, is

contagious. You "catch" it from those who have it. Only there must be contact. In so far, therefore, as you find men here in whom you see "the detail, the color, the tone," of scholarship, pass them not by. If in your elections you shun the scholar because you are not willing to suffer his mental travail, you know at the time that you are guilty of intellectual cowardice; you do not, however, quite realize that later you must for so doing pay the coward's penalty. Believe me, as I say to you that nothing lasts like the impact of a really great though hard teacher upon the mind of a student. Among all the teachers I had in preparatory, college, or professional training, one man abides with me. I refer to Clement Long, the professor of political economy when I was in college, the most impersonal man on the faculty. I doubt if at any time he knew ten men out of his classroom. But he taught men, who cared to know, the ways of knowledge, — how to measure facts, how to detect errors, how to state the truth. After many years I pay this tribute to his memory, in gratitude for his abiding influence, and as an illustration of the permanent value to any man of the endurance of hardship under a great teacher.

It is a fact of some academic significance that a national election occurs once in a man's college course. The academic value of these elections

varies, even in their reminder of the claims of citizenship upon college men. But now and then an election is peculiarly instructive. I think that the coming election is important in the academic view from the fact that agitation and contention about public issues have reached the stage of definition. I can hardly see how the present campaign can do less than to clarify the public mind. I advise you to this end to read the utterances of our most intelligent and candid men. You may well consider the campaign as something more than an interesting or possibly exciting incident in your college course.

I think that you will agree with me, as we now take up our immediate subject — The Preservation of the Spirit of Altruism in our Colleges — that although the subject comes last in the order of discussion it instantly claims precedence. Certainly it represents our academic obligation, because it represents our great academic inheritance. The glory of the historic colleges lay not so much in their scholarship in the modern sense, as in the one fact that they were founded for ends which were unmistakably altruistic, — Harvard, for "Christ and the Church," Yale, for "public employment in the Church and in the Civil State," and all the colonial colleges for like aims under different terms of consecration. You are familiar

with the specific purpose of the founding of our own college, a purpose intensified rather than concealed by its romantic origin.

Broadly stated, the terms in which the earlier generations expressed their altruistic aims were the state and the church. Colleges were founded to quicken the motives of men and to increase their efficiency in these directions, especially to increase their efficiency through the quickening of motive. The more modern foundations state their objects in the same general terms. Michigan, leading the state universities, falls back upon the language of the ordinance of 1787 to express its motive, — "Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Many of the recent foundations stand more distinctively for the advancement of science through research or application. But the ultimate end of the higher education, — more clearly its end the higher it is, — now as formerly, is altruistic.

And this ultimate end of the higher education is entirely congruous with the personal intention of those who seek its benefits. Very few men, according to my observation, come to college confirmed self-seekers. Some are morally indifferent, but they are for the most part just as indifferent

to their own best interests as they are to the best interests of others. I have noticed that when men really come to themselves in college, when, that is, they begin to realize their splendid possibilities, they are much more apt to turn to unselfish than to selfish ends.

Why then, you naturally ask me, if our colleges are founded for altruistic ends, and if college men as a rule are as well intentioned toward others as toward themselves, why should it be, why is it, so difficult for us to preserve the spirit of altruism? What I have to say further will be in answer to this question; and if in what I may say I seem to emphasize the difficulty of the problem, it is that I may also emphasize its urgency.

The first reason which I give for the difficulty of maintaining the spirit of altruism in our colleges is the lack, the rather increasing lack, of moral maturity in the average undergraduate. I do not say the lack of morality, for morality is on the whole steadily on the increase in our colleges. Nor do I say the lack of a certain moral earnestness which may at any time find vigorous expression in college sentiment. By moral maturity, I mean simply the power of a man to assume the responsibility for himself. This kind of responsibility is much more marked in a college as a whole than in the individuals who at a given time

compose it. Our colleges have made immense gains in public opinion, in general behavior, in the collective self-respect, but the average individual student has not shown the same relative gain in the power to act for his own best interest, especially in the earlier part of his course. For example, the college course is laid out by years, or by hours, a minimum number of which is assigned to each year. The object of this spacing of college work is perfectly evident. Nothing could be plainer. Every man knows at the outset that if he does not do the minimum work assigned to him in an allotted space he must soon or late pay the penalty. To change the figure, if one cannot keep the college pace, he must fall out of the running. And yet there are a great many who for no other reason whatever than that of moral irresponsibility fail, year by year, of the minimum task. And in far too many instances these failures continue beyond any reasonable time for self-adjustment. The sophomore year — I do not of course refer to any sophomore class — the sophomore year represents more than any other year arrested development. It represents the most of loss and the least of gain among the college years. The average sophomore has not yet learned how to become an upper-classman.

To meet this particular expression of moral

immaturity in the earlier years, the faculty has adopted regulations, of which you have been apprised, which make it impossible for those who neglect their work in this earlier period to make up the deficiency by extra hours in the later years, at the cost of work assigned to those years. The chief object of these regulations is to stimulate moral responsibility at the outset by making it certainly and demonstrably evident that the least penalty for early neglects and failures is overtime for graduation. A further object, as I have intimated, is to protect the later years of the college course from the effects of the earlier waste. It is to be hoped that fewer men will find themselves defrauded of advanced courses through deficiencies in the courses on which the advanced work is conditioned.

The kind of moral immaturity which I am discussing is not due to a decrease in the age of college students. There is a general impression that college students are younger than formerly. Graduates returning to the college speak of its youthful appearance. The fact is, the college age practically remains unchanged. The graduates are simply growing old. Statistics of the Eastern colleges, covering a hundred years, carefully compiled and computed, show that there has been no perceptible variation of age within the

century. The age of graduation for the first two decades of the nineteenth century was twenty-two years and six months for the first decade, and twenty-two years and nine months for the second decade. The age of graduation for the last two decades was twenty-two years and ten months for the first, and twenty-two years and nine months for the second. The average age for the century was exactly that for the last decade, — twenty-two years and nine months.

The registrar informs me that for the last three classes — 1906, '07, '08 — the age of entrance was nineteen years and three months, and of graduation twenty-three years. This average is slightly above that of the average given for the Eastern colleges at the close of the previous century; but I presume that it would be found that the like advance had been made since then in all the colleges. Practically the college period is from nineteen to twenty-three, and this certainly is not the period of boyhood, of irresponsible thought or activity. It is the period in which one may reasonably be expected to come into responsible relation to himself, to be able to organize his daily life, to make calculation for his immediate future, to adjust himself to those influences under which he has voluntarily, and perhaps with some sacrifice, placed himself.

It is, therefore, quite unreasonable to refer the moral immaturity of this period, so far as it exists, to a physical immaturity which no longer exists in such degree as to warrant the reference. The real causes of this immaturity are many, and vary with the individual, with his training, his temperament, his associations, but the remedy must be in all cases one and the same. The final appeal must be made to the individual himself. The fact that any one of you has become a college man is the sufficient ground for this appeal. It is proper for me to say to every one of you now entering college that you belong here not simply because you have met the technical requirements for entrance, but far more because it is to be assumed that you are prepared to be responsible for yourself. I am not now speaking of your responsibility to the college, to its traditions, its rules, its definite purposes. I am speaking of the very simple but very vital matter of your responsibility to and for yourselves, your ability to realize in some sufficient way the purpose for which you are here. Without this sense of responsibility all aids and helps to personal development are quickly exhausted. After a time it becomes an unjustifiable waste to follow the receding motives of college students with increasing incentives, especially with the duplication of

the teaching force. If it takes two instructors to teach twenty or twenty-five men who do not care to study, where one instructor could better teach the same number of responsible men, you can readily see that irresponsibility is costly. It is too costly to be encouraged by providing for it. Colleges were not founded and are not maintained to pay in large degree the extra cost of the indifference or the selfishness of irresponsibility. I therefore say to you frankly that the altruism which established this college ought to be met by a corresponding altruism on your part, an altruism which finds its first expression in the generous and courageous purpose to relieve the college of unnecessary burdens on your behalf. I say courageous, as well as generous, because it requires courage to meet the distracting and in some cases disorganizing influences under which you may find yourself. I commend to you a saying of Cæsar in regard to the conduct of one of his commanders in the third campaign in Gaul, in extricating the legion under his command from a most embarrassing situation. "He took counsel," Cæsar said, "of the valor of his mind." When you find yourself in mental or moral dangers take like counsel.

I add a word in this connection to the more influential men in the upper classes. You have it

in your power to raise or to lower the standards of the college. Under your influence, sometimes personal, sometimes organized, there has been a steady elevation of standards at many points. At one point you have not reached the proper standard. You are not setting the proper pace for work. You are not spreading through the college an enthusiasm for work. You are content with good results where influence demands satisfaction only with the best results. To make work popular the best men must work. If the best men among you played as some of you work, sport would not be popular. More is at stake in this regard than your personal fortunes, which can be retrieved. The standing of the college is in your hands very much as the standing of a university is in the keeping of its graduate schools. The graduate work of a university may or may not influence its undergraduate work, but it counts largely in the general average. The average law student of graduate rank does one half more, if not twice as much work, as the average undergraduate, but his extra work goes to the credit of the combination. The colleges must stand upon their own merits, creating within themselves the sentiment which will uphold their standards. In your rating of men who deserve most from the college because they are doing most for it, make a higher

place — and let it be known that you are making a higher place — for those who can create an enthusiasm for work.

The second and only other reason which I give for the difficulty of maintaining the spirit of altruism in our colleges is the incoming of so many callings, attractive to college students, which are not in themselves altruistic, and which are displacing some which were. The reaction in thought from one's future occupation is no longer in most cases a moral reaction. The college man of today can think, and plan, and work for his future without taking other people with their interests and needs into that future. And this for the reason, as we all know, that the art of living for others is quite dependent upon the opportunity for living in others. Keeping this fact in mind, we are able to grade the relative altruistic effect of the great callings by their necessary contact with human necessities, — first, because the contact is most direct, the ministry, teaching, and medicine; then at a second remove, because contact comes through the application of moral principles, these same professions again, and law and politics; then at a third remove, because giving contact through material betterments of one kind or another, callings like engineering; and then at a further remove still the various

businesses which give contact through the use of money. Now the tendencies among college men are more and more away from the professions and callings which give the most direct contact with individual life, which stir the sympathies and awaken the moral nature, and toward those which are more remote in their altruistic effects. If a man will so regard it, a factory with its teeming and throbbing life is as much a place for unselfish service as a parish or a school or a hospital; but how many men do so regard it? Wall Street may contribute its tithe to education or reform or religion; indirectly it may give its all to those material enterprises which build up the country; but who goes to Wall Street with any one of these objects first in mind or nearest his heart? When Peter Cooper went to New York, a poor lad, he had in mind Cooper Institute. As he grew in fortune that object grew. What he saw each succeeding year was not more money, but the increasing opportunity to be of service to the young men and young women of the city, an example which shows how rare it is, and yet how entirely possible, if not easy, it is to be altruistic through the use of money. I think that the time has come for our colleges to idealize in the minds of college students some of the popular callings which lack ideality. The reaction upon

college life from any calling which stands for pure secularism is dangerous. It is not the business of a college to intensify power unless it can at the same time idealize power. Some of you, the majority of you, are turning your backs upon the old professions, which, as idealized, stood for truth, for justice, for mercy. You are going into the callings which are chiefly concerned with the making and the use of money, few of which have been as yet idealized. You have, therefore, a double task before you, first to keep your own altruistic motive, such as it may be, and then, partly with this end in view, to do all that you can to affect the methods, the tone, and the spirit of your calling.

Let me refer you very definitely to certain demands which must be met before the money-making callings can be put upon the same altruistic basis with the callings which rest upon the use of personality, or upon the application of well-defined altruistic principles.

1. Money, dishonestly or unjustly made, does a harm to the country, as well as to the individual, which cannot be offset by any compensating good resulting from its after use. Charity cannot make amends for dishonesty. Hence the first and most insistent demand of altruism in business is honesty, plain, unmistakable honesty.

If a man is not prepared to meet this demand or if he has failed to meet it, it is idle for him to affect altruism.

2. Money, in the form of capital, is not a neutral, a non-moral agency, whether used by an individual, or by a corporation, or by a trust. Capital touches a thousand lives where charity touches one, and it touches each life more sensitively. Capital is very largely the money which is paid to the brain and hand of industry, or for the material which again is shaped by the same brain and hand. The income which reverts to the capitalist, be he an individual or a stockholder, is in most of the industries far less than the expenditure for labor of one sort or another. Hence the second demand of altruism in business is that one shall keep steadily in mind the human relations of money as capital.

(The capital stock of railroads for the year 1907 was $6,803,760,000. The amount paid in dividends was $272,795,000. The amount paid in wages was $900,801,000.)

3. Money, viewed as the means of power or influence or luxury, represents the highest kind of responsibility. If you propose to make money for social or political ends you thereby incur graver responsibilities than the capitalist, as the employer of labor. The two points at which the conscience

of the country is most sensitive, under the present enormous accretion of wealth, are political corruption and social extravagance. The political corruptionist has learned, or is being taught, his lesson. The social spendthrift has yet to learn his lesson, and is therefore at present the more dangerous person. The vulgar display of riches is probably the greatest irritant, if not the most demoralizing force, in the general life of the nation. Contrasts between the rich and the poor can be borne, to a degree, because it is generally understood and accepted that poverty may belong to the individual as well as to his environment, but no nation under the moral standards of to-day can long abide undisturbed by the flaunting of riches in the face of poverty. I caution you, therefore, should any of you inherit or acquire wealth, that you have a care to appearances. The plain demand of altruism in the social use of money is that its possession shall not become a stumbling-block causing offense to the life of the people.

4. Money, to be of any considerable value as a factor in benevolence, requires interested intelligence or intelligent interest on the part of its possessor. The relatively small amount of money given annually for the moral progress of the world is due not altogether to the selfishness of

the rich, but quite as much to their ignorance. Very many of the very rich do not know the value of the great civilizing forces, education, art, research, remedial agencies, missions. Some one has computed that the greater gifts to these objects during the past year were made by not more than twenty men, but there must be many hundreds of multi-millionaires in the country. The number of private-spirited citizens is enormously out of proportion to that of public-spirited citizens. Perhaps it is as just as it is charitable to attribute this vast amount of private spirit to ignorance. The late Mr. E. B. Haskell, for many years the proprietor of the "Boston Herald," once told me of his acquaintance with a fellow citizen of this type whom he met first at Yokohama. Meeting him later at Athens, as the man seemed to be lonely, he asked him if he would like to drive with him to Marathon. "Why, yes, but what happened at Marathon?" Thinking that the comparison might help him, Mr. Haskell replied that Marathon was the Gettysburg of Greece. "But what happened at Gettysburg?" This man was nearly forty years old when the battle of Gettysburg was fought, and he was doing business not three hundred miles away, but so absorbed was he in his business that the battle made no impression on him. The altruism which teaches a man how to

give broadly and wisely begins in knowledge. For a man of wealth to offer as an excuse for not giving to the great objects of moral progress that he is not interested in them, more often reflects upon his mind than upon his disposition. His shortage is in intelligence.

I have dwelt upon these demands of altruism upon college men who are proposing to themselves business careers, because you ought to know in advance what you must do to idealize your careers, so that you may keep up the succession of devoted men who are the real glory of the college and the real security of the country. You cannot afford to be non-altruistic. The college cannot afford to have you such. The country cannot afford to have you such. The true outcome of the higher education of the country is not moral neutrality. Scholarship cannot evade the just claims of altruism and long remain positive, virile, and influential. The saying holds true as one ascends to the highest objects of pursuit, "No man liveth unto himself." Living to that end alone, or supremely, he ceases to live.

What motive, then, have you, let me ask as my final word, what motive have you, strong enough, patient enough, quickening enough, to insure the altruistic spirit in the midst of the stirring actualities of college life, or in anticipa-

tion of your careers? Nothing could be more idle than for you to say to another, as your response to this address, "Go to now, let us be altruistic, let us change the temper of the college, in due time let us try to redeem society from its enslaving secularism." Back of any opinion, or spoken word, or quickened desire, must lie the high resolve, and back of the resolve the sufficient motive. Most of us, I think, fail to bring our better desires and purposes to a conclusion through some miscalculation as to the amount of motive necessary to their realization. What Matthew Arnold calls the "governing idea" must be greater than the end we propose to reach. It takes more than the spirit of liberty to make men free, more than the spirit of equality to make men equal. So Matthew Arnold points the moral in the failure of the French Revolution, saying that "however poorly men may have got on when their governing idea was 'The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom,' they can get on even less by the governing idea that 'All men are born free and equal.'" I would not have you underestimate the amount of motive which it takes to accomplish a college course, and to put you into right relation to an honorable career. Hence the question which I ask you, which I do not propose to answer, the most sobering and the

most exhilarating question which men in your circumstances can entertain, each man for himself — Is my motive, my "governing idea," big enough and stanch enough to carry me through college? Is it true enough, brave enough, and sufficiently satisfying, to enable me to meet hereafter the temptations of men and the tests of the world?

# THE RELIGION OF THE EDUCATOR

ADDRESS IN A LENTEN SERIES ON "VOCATION AND RELIGION," AT THE OLD SOUTH CHURCH, BOSTON

## THE RELIGION OF THE EDUCATOR

The most recent biographer of Pascal asks the familiar question — "Are men greater than their work, or is the reverse true?" He attempts no answer, except such as may be implied in his estimate of Pascal, of whom he says that "he is one of the small number of those in whom the man infinitely transcends his actions." Whatever may be our estimate of any man's work in its relation to his contemporaries or to the future, we cannot suppose that it altogether expresses him to himself. And in so great a matter as personal religion there must be allowance for experiences which belong entirely to the man, just because he is a man. When Mr. Lincoln went to his chamber before going out to the burial of his boy, saying to a friend, "I will try to go to God with my sorrow," — that was simply a personal, a human act: one of those acts common to us all, and quite unrelated to what we are doing, to whatever may be our vocation.

But in so far as a man's work is really significant to him, and all the more if it is significant to others, it must carry him over into that region of thought, if not of action, where by common

consent we place religion. No man can undertake a great task in a mood so confident or so careless, that it will not return to him day by day with questions so fundamental and far-reaching that he must answer them, if at all, under the very motive and through the very principles which are in their nature religious. Or if his task be undertaken in the religious mood, starting in a definite act of consecration, it will surely modify his conception of religion and his use of religion.

I think it therefore entirely proper that you have asked some of us who are engaged in representative kinds of work to speak simply and frankly of our religious views and experiences as affected by our work. You might with equal propriety have extended the list far out into the various occupations of men, for work has become so highly organized and it affects so clearly the conditions and even the destiny of many, that the worker, certainly the master worker, may at any moment be fitly challenged to declare his motive, to justify his method, to show his purpose, in a word, to avow his religion, or his substitute for it.

You have asked me to speak of the Religion of the Educator. Naturally I must speak first of my work. What is education in the sense in

which we now have to do with it? Stated in large terms, but in terms no larger than are necessary, education is the attempt to adjust the human mind to its environment. A child is born into what we call the world. Is it a new, an untried world, or is it an old world upon which generations have been experimenting? Answer this question as you must, and you see at once that somebody must begin to adjust the mind of the child to the experiences of the world. I say must begin to adjust. The training of the university is only the after-part, the final part, of this task, — "the transmission," as some one has said, "of the highest culture of one generation to the ablest youths of the next."

Or again, this world into which the child is born, is it a world of solitary places, or is it a world thick with life, full of human incentives and distractions? If the latter, then the mind must be organized to accept or to meet in their full meaning the social conditions under which it must do its work.

Or again, this world into which the child is born, is it a world in bondage to its own past, or has it an intellectual future? If the latter, then the mind of to-day must be trained to take part in the conquest of that future, to be able to join the great comradeship of searchers after truth,

truth in the gain of which alone is progress. "The highest purpose of the scientist," says the recently elected head of the Carnegie Institute, "is to predict. Prediction is the goal of science."

Or yet again, this world into which the child is born, is it all? Given the marvelous breadth of its experience, the fascinating incitements of its social life, the growing means and opportunities for intellectual conquests, are these all? Is this world, full and at its best, the complete environment of the human mind? Very few would dare to affirm that limitation. Education is not based on that mighty risk. President Eliot has continually protested against any arrangement of courses in the lower grades of instruction which leads away from, and which, if followed, will forbid the chance of the higher education. The protest is sound, and may be carried into all the processes of education. It is as uneducational to land the human mind in the restrictions of unbelief as it is to leave it under the play of superstition.

This then being the work of education, namely, to organize the mind of each succeeding generation and to adjust it to its environment, you ask me to say what is the religion of an educator, meaning by this question, as I understand, what

is the moral and spiritual setting of his work. Of the religion of any educator as a man it would be impertinent for me to speak in behalf of my fellows. Judged by the ordinary distinctions, there is as great a variety in the religious views of educators as in those of any class. In fact, the personal equation is here unusually strong, differentiating one man from another by sharp contrasts. Nevertheless you are right in assuming that the religion of an educator is affected by his work, and to the extent to which it is so affected, his religion may be spoken of as his, distinguishable from the religion of another man just like him personally, who has set himself to a different task. So that there has come to be such a thing as academic religion. The religious atmosphere of a college or university is different from that of the average church. Some things do not grow in that atmosphere which thrive elsewhere. Some things thrive there which are of feeble growth elsewhere.

The religion of an educator is conditioned upon his sense of values. The great fact which confronts him day by day is that of capacity, the capacity of the human mind. Contrast his daily experience, — it is more than observation, — of human nature with that of the judge of a police court, or with that of an earnest worker among the devitalized classes, somewhere in "the submerged tenth."

The educator sees human nature, not at its best, but just at that time when the imagination adds to fact the increment of promise. The very suggestions of power are often startling. After making full allowance for loss from dullness, and for waste from distractions, the mental product of the average school is most assuring. Capacity is seen from the varying degrees of excellence. The average mind is the background for the display of the exceptional mind. It takes a wide range numerically, usually from fifty or sixty to one hundred, to express the difference between the mind which is on the whole worth educating, worth perhaps the cost of a liberal or technical education, and the mind which is so nearly perfect in its working that it seems almost as reliable as a law of nature. It is value of this kind which is passing under the constant observation of the educator, at first hand if he is an instructor, at a second remove if he is an administrator. And if he be a man of reflection he sees and feels more and more the religious significance of the endowment of the human race with reason, an endowment which carries with it freedom, the spirit of inquiry, and the glory of personal responsibility in thought and action.

Religion would be an ill-balanced thing if left to the schools. Religion, as the experience of the

human soul, needs all which the soul has to offer through reason, and conscience, and heart. It is never at its best except as it expresses in some form the passion of the soul. But if you trace the religious spirit to its source you will find, I think, that the quality which it draws from the schools, from what I have called academic religion, is reverence. Reverence is more than anything else a habit of the mind. A great many people of religious emotion are singularly irreverent. Contrast the curiosity of the mediæval mind, its sensuous longings after heaven, with the inquiry of the modern mind (which accepts mystery) into the workings of God in nature. Contrast, if you will, the futile but restless questionings about destiny — "Lord are there few that be saved?" — with the untroubled but passionate search after truth. The conception of God which rises out of the sense of values, is that of Scripture: He is a "faithful Creator": "He cannot deny himself." Having made the human mind and given it inalienable rights, its entire freedom is guaranteed by one safeguard, and one only, reverence.

The religion of the educator is set on its practical side toward two definite results. The first of these results is rightmindedness. Rightmindedness is the department of righteousness in which

he does his chief work. Do you mean to say, you ask me, that if a man is rightminded he will not go wrong? Not at all. The mind of itself is no sufficient defense against evil from within or from without. We know men of mental rectitude who seem powerless under the assaults of appetite and passion. But mental rectitude does exclude those peculiar sins and vices which have their origin in the mind. These are many and dangerous. The conversion of the intellect, therefore, is no small part of the conversion of the man to righteousness. How is this effected? Incidentally by the training of the mind in connection with non-moral acts. The solving of a mathematical problem is not a work of righteousness, but it has a morality of its own, which if followed may lead the way into the actual moralities. The deliverance of the mind from easy, indifferent, careless, blundering methods, no matter how this deliverance has been wrought, enables it to act with moral efficiency when confronted by distinctly moral problems.

But the rightmindedness which we are now considering means nothing less than the moral disposition of the mind, the habit not simply of clear, strong, resolute thinking, but of right thinking. The most dangerous thing about education, that which every educator fears most, is the perversion of power. You see the occasional result when

some man of highly trained mind does some questionable act, usually in finance or in politics, or when he does some flagrantly ungenerous or selfish act, through his personal or corporate relation to the public. But the danger is imminent all through the process of education, increasing perhaps to the last. So that the emphasis falls increasingly upon rightmindedness. How to keep the advancing mind free from conceit and arrogance, humble enough to do its best work; how to keep the mind sane and reasonable under the incentives to narrowness, or prejudice, or strife; how to keep the mind free from the dominion of the low and sordid desires of avarice and greed, or the vulgar passion of vanity as expressed in the craving after money for display, or from the higher and more subtle ambitions which point the way to a refined selfishness; how to keep the mind, not the heart alone, accessible to the wants of humanity; how to keep the mind unclouded for the open vision of God, — these make up the moral problems of the higher education, a part of the every-day work of the technical school, the college, and the university.

What if we fail? you ask. Suppose that those who are under training add to the weaknesses of the flesh the sins of the mind, or escaping in part these weaknesses still sin through the mind?

What is the relief, the remedy? I know of one only. There is one place to which sins of every kind bring all sinning men, — the gateway of repentance. Through that gateway every man must pass who would recover his self-respect. But having said this I must go on to say that as the sins of the flesh bring a man into the straitness of repentance, so they bring him also and especially under the divine compassion. The touching fact everywhere visible in the Old Testament is the pity of God for strong men in their moments of weakness. The divine treatment as there recorded is all summed up in the joyous confession of a great soul who sinned greatly, "Thy gentleness hath made me great." Jesus knew no distinction when once the soul of man uncovered itself for forgiveness. It was Saul of Tarsus, whose life had been the great illustration of perverted intellectual power, who said of his life recovered to its better action, — "The life which I now live I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."

The religion of the educator is set on its practical side toward another end, equally essential with rightmindedness, namely, service. Service is a growing word. It is gradually setting some souls among us free from the dominion of that strong but superficial word, success. It will never

supplant the noble word of morality — duty, nor the noble word of religion — consecration, but it is the word which comes to us most directly from the mind of Christ, and which we are beginning to use as most expressive of the spirit and power of Christianity. And, it should be added, it is altogether free from cant. But I have chosen it as standing for one aim of education, because the idea for which it stands comes to us weighty with academic traditions. We cannot remind ourselves too often that the great callings which we term the professions, and which we identify with schools of learning, gained their professional standing not simply because they stood for mental attainment and mental skill, but because they stood also for service. The ministry, for the furtherance of which so many of the earlier colleges were endowed, carries its traditions in its name. God forbid that its simple meaning should ever be hidden under any term of ecclesiasticism. The law was to be ready servant of justice, and through medicine men were to do the errands of mercy. And these traditions abide, so that whenever these professions are used primarily for other ends we instinctively lower our estimate of those who so use them, if not of the professions themselves.

I have called attention to these traditions be-

cause the newer callings which have become, or which are becoming ready in other respects to take professional standing must be prepared to subject themselves to the great moral tests, to subscribe, as each calling presents his man, to the oath of service. We have the singular contradiction in the intellectual life of our time, that as the tendencies toward commercialism grow stronger in some of the established professions, the academic spirit is invading the distinctly commercial callings and inviting them to accept the moral as well as mental discipline which leads to professional standing.

It is not however chiefly with the professions or callings with which education is concerned in its insistence upon the spirit of service, but with individuals. Moral passion is not often distributed among men with any approach to equality. It finds room here and there in receptive hearts. The principle seems to be that with equal mental preparation, some are more susceptible than others to the moral impulse, are able or willing to guard it with more certain care, and when the time of action comes are ready to act more unselfishly. It is quite worth while to maintain institutions for their product in rare men, men who but for these would never have been developed to the point where the spiritual impulse could take

effect. A great deal of the best work of education must be measured by its results in the few. Still the whole force of institutional work, mental and moral, is set for all. The democracy of institutional life is perhaps more strongly marked on its moral than on its intellectual side. Certainly no mental test can determine in advance who is to be accounted the greatest in the realm of service.

It is noticeable that this uncertainty of result, or as one may better say, this widening of moral possibilities, has increased with the opening of academic life into the life of the world. The solicitations of the world are not temptations to every soul. To some they are appeals and pleadings. Now and then a man more accustomed to books than to men hears the call of God where men are. And it is also noticeable that with the accomplishment in so large degree of the work of criticism, especially in the field of religion, the moral and spiritual instincts of young men are once more stirring toward action. I shall be surprised if within the next decade there is not a sufficient reinforcement of the church, for its greater and more necessitous service, from the awakening spiritual life in our colleges and universities.

But all predictions or even observations aside,

no one questions the necessity for the incoming of strong spiritual motives as the intellectual life draws near to action. No educator can allow himself to be indifferent to the spirit which a man takes with him who enters the world by way of the school. He recognizes it as a part of the business of modern education, if not his personal business, to uncover the deeper ways of the world to those who are to enter it, to show them how the stronger and finer ambitions can there be satisfied, to encourage in them a reasonable and a resolute faith in the practicability of righteousness. Not all men in the academic service can do this. Some can do better work in other, and to them more familiar ways. But some men must do this very thing as an essential part of the business of modern education. We must have a clearer, better defined and more effective moral connection between our higher institutions of learning and the world. That connection can only be made with certainty and efficiency through the spirit of service. You cannot say to a man, "Do this," or "Do that." You can make it necessary for him, through the urgencies of his own spirit, to serve the world. Inspiration, in other words, is as legitimate a part of education as instruction. Among the critics, scholars, teachers, administrators who make up the educa-

tional force of a great institution there must be some man of sufficient inspirational power to keep open the moral connection with the world. He may be, in one and the same person, the critic, or the scholar, or the teacher, or the administrator. There is no choice or advantage of one department, or function, or place above another. Any man, who can fully satisfy any educational position which he may occupy, may add to it if he can, moral inspiration. The condition, however, to which I have referred is inexorable. Moral inspiration can never come from a man who is not able to do his own first and great duty, and to do it well. From such an one inspiration flattens into exhortation.

In answering your question thus far about the religion of the educator, I have asked you to note upon what it is that his religion is conditioned, — namely, upon his sense of values as revealed to him in the capacity of the human mind: and I have asked you also to note the particular ends toward which it is, and must be set, namely, rightmindedness as a part of righteousness, and service, as alone satisfying the public reason for education.

You naturally go farther and ask me for the content of the religious faith of an educator. I suppose that you do not mean to ask what are his

theological holdings, for we do not express ourselves to-day in theological as much as in religious terms. This fact means that we have changed the emphasis from the content of faith to the tone of faith. The question in the popular mind in regard to any man in whom it is interested religiously is not, so much as formerly, what he believes, but much more than formerly, how he believes. Formerly the distinction was, Is a man orthodox or heterodox? To-day the distinction is,— Is a man an optimist or a pessimist? Our religious beliefs and denials are experienced in shades and colors rather than in sharp and rigid outlines. And this means that we believe, or doubt, or deny, much more according to our experience of the world than according to logic.

This distinction is so important in enabling me to express the religious faith of the educator, that I must give you brief illustrations of it.

Here is a note of pessimism so deep and so pathetic that it has held the ear of the world for centuries. "Then I returned and saw all the oppressions that are done under the sun: and behold the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors there was power; but they had no comforter. Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead more than the living which are yet

alive; yea, better than them both, him which hath not yet been, who hath not seen the evil work that is done under the sun." What is modern pessimism, of the East or of the West, but a faint echo of this ancient plaint?

Or take the word of this same old-time preacher, as he styles himself, as in another mood he looks out upon nature and takes account of the glorious contradiction in his view, as it also includes man. "He hath made everything beautiful in its time: also he hath set eternity in their heart: yet so that man cannot find out the work that God hath done from the beginning even to the end." In what other words can we express our joy in the changing beauty of nature, stilled it may be for the moment by the deep sense of the eternal in ourselves, and solemnized by the yet deeper sense of the unfathomable mysteries in which we think and work? What better reflection have we of the religious alternatives of the modern mind as it surrenders itself to the joys of the old Greek in the outer world, to be suddenly recalled to the old Hebrew's sense of eternity in the inner man?

Or once more, take the one great illustration of pure christian optimism, born out of the certain and joyous experience of the soul. "Beloved, now are we the children of God. And it is not

yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that if he shall be manifested we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is."

What now is the faith of the educator according to his experience of the world? Does he come up out of his work with the great christian holdings of faith? Yes, I think that he does, not as declared in the creeds, but as held in convictions. God is too near to one, who works in the mind of man, to be overlooked. Sin is too imminent, in view of the perversions of intellectual and moral power, to be ignored or made light of. The world is too needy, and needs so much the best which any man has to give, and to have it given in the best way, that one does not dare to trust the well-trained and well-motived life to any other than that Master of human service, who through service and sacrifice has set himself to the task of saving and satisfying this world. If we take Christianity, not according to its divergent creeds, but according to its great conceptions which unify and inspire, its conceptions of God, of immortality, of the worth of man and of his danger, of the personality of Jesus in his relation to the sin of men and to the progress of the world, you will have, I think, an overwhelming consensus of religious faith among educators, as we know them, in beliefs which are distinctly

christian. But it is when you pass from the content of religious faith to its tone, that you find in yet clearer distinction the tone of a sane christian optimism.

I must remind you yet again that I am speaking of the faith of the educator as such. The personal element may enter into the faith of any worker to change its tone. Temperament, or personal experience, or some overmastering event in life, or some peculiar inheritance in faith itself may modify or altogether neutralize the effect of work upon faith. But the work of education leads the way as surely as any known work, into the certainty and gladness of faith. It must needs be so. It is work in mind and in truth, the two great realities. The proportion therefore of the permanent in it is very great. Something of the work goes over into character, something of it goes into increase of knowledge, something of it goes into the general progress of the world, and something is put on deposit, enlarging the foundation of institutions. Nothing save the church, — and this can rarely be said of individual churches, — nothing is so permanent as the great foundations of learning. And as the centuries increase upon them they bear increasing testimony to the glorious optimism of their work.

The general subject, under which this address falls, is Vocation and Religion. Vocation is a man's elect work, not that which comes upon him by compulsion, except it be the compulsion of a great choice. Whoever undertakes the work of education in this spirit may not only carry it on in the optimism of religious faith, but when he lays it down, he may leave it with the ancient prayer of an unfaltering hope upon his lips, "Establish thou the work of our hands upon us, yea, the work of our hands establish thou it."

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE . MASSACHUSETTS
U . S . A

① The Spirit of Prophecy =
1) In Scripture.
2) In History =
3) In the moral Sphere of men.
4) In the realization of the highest things
5) In the hopes of mankind or in the future.